DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 210 95 SE 017 306

AUTHOR Joranson, Philip N., Ed.; Anderson, C. Alan, Ed.
TITLE Religious Reconstruction for the Environmental Future, Proceedings Report (The University of Connecticut, November 30-December 2, 1972).
INSTITUTION Faith-Man-Nature Group, South Coventry, Conn.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Environmental Education.
PUB DATE Oct 73
NOTE 127p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Faith-Man-Nature Group, P.O. Box 397, South Coventry, Connecticut 06238 ($2.00, postpaid)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; Ecology; *Environment; Ethical Values; Ethics; *Futures (of Society); Interdisciplinary Approach; Natural Resources; Political Attitudes; *Religion; Social Factors; Social Responsibility; Values; Workshops; *World Problems

ABSTRACT

This is the proceedings from a workshop that focused on the capacity of religious systems around the world to deal with environmental problems. Included in this publication are an introduction, the workshop schedule, a participant roster, and five papers presented at the workshop. Topics covered in the papers include: Religious Reconstruction for the Environmental Future; Native Wholeness; History and Nature in the Judeo-Christian Tradition: How Will the Future Be Different?; Where Are We Now in Relation to Political Participation in the Public Interest, in Our Technological Society?; and Reconstructions of Scientific and Religious Consciousness for a Better Environmental Future. A Reporting Session: Task Groups for Reconstructive Follow-Through concludes this publication. (BT)

NOV. 30 - DEC. 2, 1972

Religious Reconstruction for The Environmental Future

ED103210

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY WORKSHOP TO CONFRONT A GLOBAL ETHICAL URGENCY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AT THE BISHOP CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
AT STOPRS, CONN.

ARRANGED BY THE F M N GROUP
AND ENABLED UNDER A GRANT FROM
THE OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

SE 017 306

PROCEEDINGS REPORT

PHILIP N. JORANSON AND C. ALAN ANDERSON
EDITORS

OCTOBER, 1973

- Table of Contents -

Introduction
Philip N. Joranson, Workshop Project Director Int 1 - Int 5

Workshop Schedule WS 1 - WS 5

Participant Roster PR 1 - PR 3

Papers in Order of Presentation

- Religious Reconstruction for the Environmental Future - The Great Needs and Issues as I Saw Them at the Stockholm Meetings in June
  Norman J. Faramelli Fa 1 - Fa 29
- Native Wholeness
  J.W.E. Newbery Ne 1 - Ne 15
- History and Nature in the Judeo-Christian Tradition: How Will the Future Be Different?
  Bernard E. Meland Me 1 - Me 14
- Where Are We Now in Relation to Political Participation in the Public Interest, in our Technological Society?
  Donald G. Morgan Mo 1 - Mo 15
- Reconstructions of Scientific and Religious Consciousness for a Better Environmental Future
  George A. Riggan Ri 1 - Ri 19
- Reporting Session: Task Groups for Reconstructive Follow-Through
  Frederick P. Ferré - Session Moderator
  C. Alan Anderson - Editor of Reports and Comments RS 1 - RS 19

Introduction

Philip N. Joranson

This is a proceedings publication from a workshop focused upon the capacity of religious systems around the world to deal with environmental implications in the many modes that are being recognized today as parts of the fabric of reality of ecosystem functioning and of personal and community life. What concerned the conferees was how to understand and meet pressures for religious reconstruction, especially in areas of theological and philosophical approach, in life style and institutional expression, and in science-related modes. At this particular workshop, three major religious traditions were included for characterization and study in relation to each other: native American, Judeo-Christian and Buddhist. Among those who attended, not a few were experienced in some phase of the broad agenda. Five of the conferees had been in Stockholm several months earlier for international meetings there centering on the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.

Held at Storrs, Connecticut, this workshop was made possible by a grant under the Environmental Education Act, administered by the Office of Environmental Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.* It was the first of a series of three such events held in different regions of the country, and was planned for the northeastern part of the country. The site of the second similar event was Bowling Green (Ohio) State University, and the third workshop was developed at The University of Wisconsin, Green Bay Campus.

We gratefully and sincerely endorse the notation of credit and disclaimer on this page and we also hold the same statement of principle to be indispensable to F-M-N Group functioning in integrity and creative purpose. All of the speakers and all of the conferees attending were invited as co-workers and co-inquirers in a process designed to move together toward wider understanding and greater insight. We emphatically affirm, therefore that opinions expressed in any included paper, task group report or discussion comment should be regarded as contributions of perspective to wide issues and problem areas in a process of continuing study, and that such opinions do not necessarily reflect a position or policy or endorsement of the Faith-Man-Nature Group. But we want to say with equal emphasis that we publish here because we think this is an important process that can contribute by becoming available to readers elsewhere who may find points of contact with their interests and concerns.

---

*The project reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Some comments about the perspective papers included here and their authors are in order, and we will also indicate the kinds of thoughts and challenges that were shared by some of the speakers whose remarks are not included in full. The texts of papers as they appear here in most cases reflect some revision from the original spoken version, but in many places the spontaneity of conversational style has been retained in these proceedings.

In my introductory remarks at the opening workshop session, I tried to suggest the character and spirit envisioned in the planning by quoting from statements by Professor Theodore Gaster of Barnard College and by Philip Abelson, Editor of Science magazine. Among the many definitions of religion that have been formulated, Gaster's grows out of his experience as Professor of World Religions and seems highly appropriate to the concerns of the workshop. He sees religion as "a synthesis of thought, emotion, and behavior whereby under sanction men attempt to formulate and articulate their place in the scheme of things," and that "points to dimension beyond the immediate." This is a way of looking at religion as a total system and is especially helpful in getting at component elements and considerations of the widest variety.

The quotation from Philip Abelson is a paragraph in his Science editorial of 15 September 1972. It was written in reference to international congresses and applies with equal force to this workshop addressed to Religious Reconstruction for the Environmental Future. "The major value of such gatherings," said Abelson, "lies in the facilitation of human contact. These contacts permit quick mutual evaluation to a depth that no amount of correspondence could ever achieve. Given a meeting of minds, new friendships are formed that carry with them trust and a willingness to enter into all manner of collaborative arrangements at the meeting and subsequently."

Dr. Norman J. Faramelli, who gave the opening perspective paper on the Stockholm meetings, is trained and experienced both as chemical engineer and as theologian. He is well known as an advocate of environmental thinking and action that starts by asking what kinds of programs will result in a much more equal sharing of access to environmental benefits and resources. Faramelli has been a leader in efforts to persuade Boston area people in favor of mass transportation development.

Dr. J.W.E. Newbery spoke at Storrs in Session 2 on "Native Wholeness". Newbery had attracted much attention to the subject of his paper earlier in the year at an international meeting in Los Angeles. The original paper as presented there appears here by permission of the author.

The remarks of Dr. Bernard E. Meland, which came next in Session 2, reflect his own early convictions about attitudes toward nature in the Judeo-Christian tradition. What Meland had said in the two chapters he mentions in his 1934 Modern Man's Worship would have to be seen as a clear, but rare exception to a well known observation in Aldo Leopold's Sand County Almanac. Writing in 1948, Leopold said there,

> "No important change in ethics was ever accomplished without an internal change in our intellectual emphasis, loyalties, affections, and convictions. The proof that conservation has not yet touched these foundations of conduct lies in the fact that philosophy and religion have not yet heard of it. In our attempts to make conservation easy, we have made it trivial."*

In his talk following Dr. Paul Bock's introduction to Session 3, Dr. Donald G. Morgan of Mt. Holyoke College described some of his own recent research. Using a case study comparison, he focuses on the influence of technological change upon policy decisions in the public interest, in the American constitutional order. Comments presented by Dr. Carlos Stern of the University of Connecticut immediately followed some initial discussion of Morgan's paper. Stern called attention to some further factors in trying to deal with the theme of that session - "Harmonizing contending values in the planning of land and other natural resource use - what is involved?". He pointed out that in environmental decisions, there is not one way that is the morally right way. Rather, both plus and minus value factors are associated with any of the alternative routes. The decision is always a value compromise or trade-off: always something gained, something lost. He stressed also other observations: (1) that we must in every instance ask who is planning, for whom; (2) that plans soon become out of date, so that there is always a tension between the need to have a definite plan and the need for flexibility; and (3) that the compound interest rate has a strong effect on the likelihood of development of a natural resource.

---

* Leopold, Aldo, A Sand County Almanac, With Other Essays on Conservation from Round River. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966, p. 225.

Under the title "Reconstructions of Scientific and Religious Consciousness for a Better Environmental Future", Dr. George A. Riggan has elaborated somewhat his original remarks. Dr. Riggan is chairman of the board of the Center for Advanced Studies on Religion in an Age of Science, and Professor of Systematic Theology at the Hartford Seminary Foundation. He was a co-developer there in 1971 of a pioneering graduate course on "Perspectives on the Population/Environment Crisis."

Much of the lively discussion that took place during the workshop, including that which followed the viewing of the two films, is not reproduced here, but tape records were made and are available of all of the plenary discussions and all of the papers and introductory remarks of session moderators. We are indebted, in the final session at which the reports of the "Task Groups for Reconstructive Follow-Through" were given and discussed, to Dr. Frederick P. Ferré, Professor of Philosophy at Dickinson College, for his role as moderator, and to Dr. C. Alan Anderson, Chairman of the Humanities Division at Curry College, for his willingness to serve as editor of the reports and comments made during that session.

For her able service at every stage from the workshop announcements to the tape transcriptions and final typing of this proceedings report, we are indebted to Mrs. Louise Gagne, secretary in the project headquarters office. Others who contributed in various ways in the work of the Storrs Workshop Planning and Arrangements Group were: Dr. H. Paul Santmire, Chaplain and Professor of Religion at Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts; Dr. Norman J. Faramelli, Associate Director of the Boston Industrial Mission, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Dr. Paul Bock, Professor of Hydrology and Water Resources in the University of Connecticut's College of Engineering; Mr. Geroge H. Murray, Associate Extension Professor, Institute of Public Service of the University of Connecticut; Dr. Carlos Stern, Assistant Professor of Environmental Economics in the University of Connecticut's College of Agriculture and Natural Resources; and Dr. Albert Jeffers, Director of the University of Connecticut's Division of Institutes and Conferences and associated staff members there and at the University Audio-Visual Laboratory and Faculty Alumni Center. We are grateful for many courtesies extended by the University of Connecticut, and for the cordial welcome with which the meetings were launched in the remarks of Vice-President for Academic Programs Kenneth G. Wilson.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

For further information about the Faith-Man-Nature Group, the regional workshops project, publications and membership, contact the temporary headquarters office:

Faith-Man-Nature Group

P.O. Box 397

South Coventry, Connecticut 06238

Telephone: (203) 742-5065
or
(203) 742-9566

"Religious Reconstruction for the Environmental Future"

An Interdisciplinary Workshop

To Confront A Global Ethical Urgency

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Thursday, November 30, 1972

- At Faculty Alumni Center -

5:00 - 7:00 p.m. - Registration and room assignment

6:30 p.m. - Reception

7:15 p.m. - Dinner

- At Bishop Center for Continuing Education -

8:30 - 10:00 p.m. - OPENING SESSION

1. Objectives and background of this workshop - Philip N. Joranson, Chairman, F-M-N Group
2. Welcome from the host institution - Kenneth G. Wilson, Academic Vice-President, The University of Connecticut
3. An Opening Statement of Perspective:

   "Religious Reconstruction for the Environmental Future - The Great Needs and Issues as I Saw Them at the Stockholm Meetings in June" - Norman J. Faramelli, Associate Director, Boston Industrial Mission, Cambridge, Mass.

Friday, December 1, 1972

- Meals in the Whitney Hall Dining Room -

- Sessions at Bishop Center for Continuing Education -

7:30 - 8:15 a.m. - Breakfast

8:45 a.m. - SESSION 2

"What is the challenge to the adherents of all the world's religious and ethical systems implied by their common involvement in global environmental benefits and abuses?"

Two panelists respond:

A. J.W.E. Newbery on "Native Wholeness" (Newbery is Professor and Director of Amerindian Studies at the University of Sudbury, Sudbury, Ontario)

B. Bernard E. Meland on "History and Nature in the Judeo-Christian tradition: How will the future be different?" (Meland is Professor Emeritus of Constructive Theology, Divinity School of the University of Chicago)

10:15 - 10:30 a.m. - Coffee and Conversation

10:30 - 11:50 a.m. - Plenary discussion to continue this quest

Moderator: Ross J. Miller, Director, United Christian Fellowship, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio

12:00 noon - Lunch

1:30 p.m. - SESSION 3

"Harmonizing contending values in the planning of land and other natural resource use - what is involved?"

Moderator: Paul Bock, Professor of Hydrology and Water Resources, School of Engineering, University of Connecticut

1. Introduction by the session moderator.
2. "Where Are We Now In Political Participation In the Public Interest, In Our Technological Society?", Donald Morgan, Professor of Political Science, Mount Holyoke College. Discussion.
3. Panelists from several different disciplines and agencies discuss some current example problems and the kinds of value considerations they raise.

   Comments by Carlos Stern, Assistant Professor of Environmental Economics, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Connecticut.

   Discussion

3:15 - 3:45 p.m. - Coffee and Conversation

3:45 p.m. - SESSION 4

Moderator: Winthrop Stone, Minister, Storrs Congregational Church, Storrs, Connecticut

"What contributions to religious reconstruction for the environmental future can we expect--

1. --from scientific understanding?"
   Comments by George Riggan, Professor of Systematic Theology at the Hartford Seminary Foundation.

   Discussion

5:00 p.m. - Evening meal at Whitney Hall dining room

7:30 p.m. - (continuation of SESSION 4)

2. --from specific developments in world religious and ethical tradition that are marked by positive perceptions of nature?"
   Two films of 20-25 minutes each were viewed and discussed at length by the entire workshop group:

"Buddhism, Man and Nature", with voice commentary by Alan Watts, produced by the International Institute for the Study of Religions, and made available to this workshop by William C. Bullard, Office of Environmental Interpretation, National Park Service.

"Song of the Earth", with voice commentary by Gary Herbertson, produced by Line Films, and featuring the life of St. Francis of Assisi.

Saturday, December 2, 1972

- Meals at University Commons -

- Sessions at Bishop Center for Continuing Education -

7:30 - 8:15 a.m. - Breakfast

9:00 a.m. - SESSION 5

Task Group Sessions For Reconstructive Follow-Through

1. The Announced Saturday Morning Schedule

The advance program announcement anticipated the Saturday morning activities as follows:

"During the morning, all workshop participants will have a chance to work in one or more TASK GROUP sessions on such major workshop themes as those listed below, plus others that may be called for by the workshop membership. We expect to be flexible in scheduling, and to assist in this will divide the morning into two task group periods of 75 minutes each, with a combined coffee break and brief plenary period. Some of the task groups may need both periods; others may meet only during the first period or only during the second period, but the bulletin board will keep all advised of when and where all task groups will meet.

Each task group will have a moderator, resource people and a recorder-reporter, and each will contribute to the final plenary reporting session in the afternoon at 2:00 p.m.

The task groups already on the program schedule for Saturday morning will be poised for RECONSTRUCTIVE FOLLOW-THROUGH:

1. In public policy for the public interest.
2. In theology and philosophy.
3. In religious institutions.
4. In defining terms and using precise language.
5. In the program focus of the F-M-N Group.
6. In life style that is responsive - ethically, sensitively, intelligently.
7. In new educational programs."

2. The Saturday Morning Schedule As Actually Developed By The Conference.

What actually happened Saturday morning? The conferees made a joint decision to recognize three task groups that would meet during the first 75-minute period (9:10 - 10:25 a.m.) As agendas for these, they proposed the following:

TASK GROUP I -- For reconstruction for public policy in the public interest, and for reconstruction in religious institutions.

TASK GROUP II - For reconstruction in life style that is responsive - ethically, sensitively, intelligently.

TASK GROUP III - For reconstruction in theology and philosophy.

But the people who had chosen TASK GROUP III (theology and philosophy) had recognized important agendal relationships with TASK GROUP II (life style). GROUP III, accordingly decided to meet first with TASK GROUP II and remained with GROUP II till the end of the first 75 minute period.

Following the break after the first period, the GROUP III constituency then withdrew from joint session with GROUP II and held its own separate session during the second period. (10:40 - 11:55 a.m.)

Another change took place as the second period started. TASK GROUPS I and II met together during that period, recognizing a need to pursue what were seen as significant interconnections between their agendas.

During the second period there was also a literature display in the central workshop room, focused upon reconstruction in new educational programs, supporting literature and other resources. This display was later available to all at their leisure, and no special task group meeting was convened for that purpose.

12:00 noon - Lunch

2:00 - 3:30 p.m. - Final Plenary Session

Moderator: Frederick P. Ferré, Professor of Philosophy, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania

1. Introduction by the moderator.
2. Reports and proposals from all of the task groups that met during the morning, including recorder-reporter summaries by C. Alan Anderson, Professor of Philosophy and Chairman, Dept. of Humanities, Curry College, Milton, Mass.; Jessma O. Blockwick, Acting Director, Dept. of Population Problems, Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church, Washington, D.C.; Chauncey G. Olinger, recently on the Staff of U.S. Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on the UN Conference on the Human Environment, New York City; and others.
3. What is anticipated in continuity from the weekend at Storrs: plans for further workshop events in other regions.

Participant Roster

Anderson, C. Alan
Professor of Philosophy
Chairman, Div. of Humanities
Curry College
Milton, Mass. 02186

Barbour, Ian G.
Chairman, Dept. of Religion &
Professor of Physics
Carleton College
Northfield, Minn. 55057

Blockwick, Jessma O.
Acting Director
Dept. of Population Problems
Board of Church and Society of
The United Methodist Church
100 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Bock, Paul
Professor of Hydrology &
Water Resources
School of Engineering
University of Connecticut
4 Walker Lane
West Hartford, Conn. 06117

Brueckner, Paul H.
Developer of the "Overlife"
Program
426 S. Linden Avenue
Miamisburg, Ohio 45342

Bullard, William C.
NEEL Coordinator
National Park Service
Office of Environmental
Interpretation
Washington, D.C. 20240

D'Antonio, William V.
Professor & Head, Dept. of
Sociology and Exec. Sec'y of
the Society for the Scientific
Study of Religion
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Elder, Frederick
Doctoral Student, Religion &
Society, at Harvard
University
17 Manning Street
Lexington, Mass. 02173

Faramelli, Norman J.
Associate Director
Boston Industrial Mission
56 Boylston Street
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Ferré, Frederick P.
Professor of Philosophy
Dickinson College
111 S. College Street
Carlisle, Penn. 17013

Fluharty, Charles W.
Divinity Student, Yale
Divinity School, Farmer
101 Lawrence Street
New Haven, Conn. 06510

Gagne, Louise B.
Headquarters Secretary for
FMN/OEE Workshops Project
232 Lake Road
Andover, Conn. 06232

Gagne, Peter D.
Computer Programmer
Pratt & Whitney, Div. of
United Aircraft
East Hartford, Conn.

Hill, Laurence M.
Pastor
58 Bay State Road
Lynn, Mass. 01904

Jefferson, Elizabeth
Public School Teacher
22 Brunswick Road
Montclair, New Jersey 07042

Jefferson, Kinmoth
Staff Member in the Office of
the Urban Ministries
National Division of the
Board of Global Ministries
of the United Methodist
Church
475 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10027

Joranson, Philip N.
Chairman, F-M-N Group &
Director, FMN/OEE
Workshops Project
P.O. Box 397
South Coventry, Conn. 06238

Joranson, Sue
Cider Mill Road
Andover, Conn. 06232

Maslan, Frank
Research II, Agricultural
Economics
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

McGowan, Carole
Environmental Consultant
11 Pleasant Street
New Haven, Conn. 06511

Meland, Bernard E.
Professor Emeritus
Divinity School, University
of Chicago
6834 Oglesby Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60649

Miller, Ross J.
Director, United Christian
Fellowship
Bowling Green University
313 Thurstin
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

Mirza, Mushtagalikhan
Graduate Student, Environmental Engineering
University of Connecticut
197 6th Street
Providence, Rhode Island

Moore, Michael
Graduate Student, Yale Divini
School
Killam's Point
Branford, Connecticut 06405

Morgan, Donald G.
Professor of Political Scienc
Mount Holyoke College
South Hadley, Mass. 02175

Morgan, Margaret P.
12 Stanton Avenue
South Hadley, Mass 02175

Murray, George H.
Assoc. Extension Professor
Institute of Public Service
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Newbery, J.W.E.
Professor and Director
Amerindian Studies
University of Sudbury
Laurentian Campus
Sudbury, Ontario, CANADA

Olinger, Chauncey G.
Former Instructor of
Philosophy at Rutgers
University, and recently on
Staff of U.S. Secretary of
State's Advisory Committee
on UN Conference on the
Human Environment
4f, 301 West 105th Street
New York, New York 10025

Riggan, George A.
Riley Professor of Systematic
Theology
Hartford Seminary Foundation
96 Sherman Street
Hartford, Conn. 06510

Stern, Carlos
Asst. Professor
Environmental Economics
College of Agriculture and
Natural Resources
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Stone, Winthrop E.
Minister
Storrs Congregational Church
2 Willowbrook Road
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Thomas, L. Eugene
Associate Professor
Dept. of Child Development &
Family Relations
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Tudesco, Jim
Minister to Students
Storrs Congregational Church
Route 195
North Eagleville Road
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Walker, Marshall J.
Professor of Physics
Dept. of Physics
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Wass, Philmore
Director, Economic Educational
Center
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Weliczko, John
Pastor and Doctoral Candidate
(Theology)
142 Vernon Avenue - Apt.56
Vernon, Connecticut 06066

Wilson, Kenneth G.
Vice-President for Academic
Programs
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

Wright, Sylvia
Office of Environmental
Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

FMN/OEE WORKSHOP
30NOV-2DEC'72
STORRS, CT.

Religious Reconstruction for the Environmental Future - The Great Needs and Issues as I Saw Them at the Stockholm Meetings in June

Norman J. Faramelli

Thank you very much, Phil. I'm sorry Ken (Wilson) left because the order of our program seems to be a little unusual. The motto is "tonight the world, tomorrow eastern Connecticut." I'm also sorry that Fred Smith was unable to make it, but he hasn't been feeling well and extends his apologies.

I was in Stockholm under the auspices of the National Presbyterian Church and the National Episcopal Church, each paying half the bill. I was with a small group - Religious Task Force on the Global Environment. Several people who are here tonight were on that task force - Phil, Ian Barbour and Jessma Blockwick. Jessma was there, I guess, longer than I. She arrived earlier and had a chance to sense things beforehand. I am sure that during the course of our discussions, you will have an opportunity to get other perspectives besides mine.

Stockholm during those first two weeks in June was a very exciting place. In fact, it was something like an environmental smorgåsbord. It was difficult to find out what exactly was going on, let alone to interpret the significance of all the meetings. I think perhaps, the most significant meetings that took place were the ones between the American petroleum managers and the representatives from the Third World. Those meetings, not reported by the press, probably had more effect on the future urban environment and the future global environment than all of the resolutions passed at the United Nations, at that convention or at any other one. There were a good number of businessmen at Stockholm, but of course there were a lot of other people and events as well.

I want to begin by first sharing with you three perceptions about Stockholm and then go into three major issues. I do not want to talk about the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, largely because there has been a good deal written on that. People have written on it much better, and more comprehensively than I could possibly put it together.

Three Perceptions

The first perception has to do with the political stance of many of the people I met in Stockholm, both the UN delegates and the non-delegates. When we went to the Environment Forum (administered by Swedish UN Ass'n and Nat'l Council of Swedish Youth with a grant from Swedish government), the Peoples Forum (sponsored by a Swedish leftist group) and all of the other environmental side-shows in Stockholm, there seemed to be a tremendous concern expressed by many western environmentalists. Somehow the world was going to hell in a hand basket and we ought to transcend politics and rise up immediately and save the environment. Well, it is difficult to ask the United Nations to transcend politics, because it is primarily a political body. That is point number one. Number two - I was struck (and again my own biases will be obviously manifested here) with a real potpourri of political philosophies displayed by the environmentalists. Some were definitely radical, some were reformers, some were, for lack of a better term, naive as hell politically. That was particularly evident among those who said that the UN should rise up above politics and act to save the environment. They acted as if pollution were the only problem facing mankind.

After two weeks, it became clear that the expression "quality of life" is not a commonly shared experience. The term may be common, but it means a lot of different things to different people. For instance, I remember meeting with one of the advisors to the African delegations in one of our regular morning meetings of the Religious Task Force. He kept talking about "development" and "quality of life" synonymously. And when he mentioned development, he was not talking about new conceptions of development as liberation. He was talking about old concepts of economic growth, very old concepts that are believed in Uganda and Tanzania. He seemed to mean that "quality of life" was only going to be improved if economic growth occurred via industrialization. For the Westerners present, "quality of life" meant something else. For some it clearly had a ubiquitous character. For others it meant improving the "quality of life" for some people - namely those who are affluent enough to rebel against affluence - which is not an unusual thing in Western societies.

Now the second perception of Stockholm was the seriousness of the ecological crisis itself. Nothing I saw, heard or experienced convinced me that the ecological crisis was a fabricated crisis or that ecology was not a real and crucial issue. Despite the politics of some of the people who espoused different aspects of that issue, one thing was crystal clear: there is a serious environmental condition which is of such proportions that it can truly be called a crisis. That does not mean that there will be no life forms on earth after the year 2000. It does mean that given the way in which industrialization is moving today, we are heading toward experiencing a gradual erosion of "quality of life." Or as T.S. Eliot said, the world may not end "with a bang, but with a whimper." It could be that we shall become habituated to a series of deteriorating environmental cricumstances, and will just learn to adjust. Someone said to us recently, "Why shouldn't people wear gas masks in cities: there was a time when they thought they could swim in the Charles River? People haven't lost much when they don't swim in the Charles River; they're not going to lose much if they wear gas masks." Admittedly, a gas mask is a lot better than inhaling all that junk, so what's wrong with it? There is an interesting perception here.

The third perception has to do with the interrelationships of all of the issues we talk about. For instance, the work done by the Club of Rome, The Limits to Growth, in many ways captures all of the strengths and weaknesses that go along with the environmental movement. Let me start with some of the strengths, and then I shall go on to some of the issues. One perception that came clear to me is that the authors of The Limits to Growth, who spoke of the necessity of relating all of the variables simultaneously, are right on target. That is exactly where it is at. To say that some people overstress our population explosion may be a reality. To say, however, *ipso facto* that population is a non-problem is a blatant falsity. The same thing could be said about pollution, depletion of natural resources, industrial growth, etc.

Although we have to think comprehensively in many ways, there is an inherent difficulty when we do that. Whenever we try to deal with global or cosmic systems, we tend to create a particular model and try to abstract ourselves from the process of history. One of the difficulties in coming to grips with all of these interrelated variables is that we do not have political and economic structures that can cope with all these interrelated variables. Thus, there is a tendency to abstract oneself from history and to somehow look at the world *sub specie aeternitatis* - from the perspective of eternity. That is, somehow if I can create the right computer model, I could look at reality and relate all of these variables together. Therefore, I am given a superior wisdom that other people do not possess. Now there is an element of truth in that, but the problem and its principal weakness is that the real world is involved with a series of competing factions, class struggles, and institutional structures - economic and political. To think we can transcend them is to think that we can transcend our own history. I think we used to call people who espoused that view Gnostics or Manicheans. We cannot afford to be Manicheans or Gnostics about the stuff of history. Just because we respect the natural order does not mean that we can be oblivious to historical realities.

The Three Major Issues

These three different perceptions are simply prolegomena to the three basic issues that I want to focus on that were very much alive in the Environmental Forum, the Peoples Forum, the Dai Dong conference and all of the other side-shows. They also came up with UN delegates, most explicitly when they were away from UN meetings because the political conference essentially concentrated on those environmental issues that were most resolvable. For example, since there is going to be a UN conference in '74 on population, nobody wanted to talk about population at the Stockholm UN conference. There was much discussion, however, about population as we went around to the different meetings. There were so many things said about population control that many times there was a generation of heat rather than light, i.e., more time spent on invective than there was trying to understand what the population explosion was all about.

(1) Americans and others familiar with the Commoner/ Ehrlich debate felt very much at home with the Environmental Forum because it was dominated by Barry Commoner. Some of his antics left much to be desired, but I do not want to focus on personalities, but the issues that were espoused.

Barry Commoner gave a brilliant opening statement on the need for looking at the social justice aspects of the environmental movement. In his presentation, he articulated a statement on anti-population control which caused a few problems for many of us. (Believe me, as Jessma knows full well, population is not my point of departure. Nevertheless, I was still irritated). But at one afternoon meeting we finally got Barry Commoner to take a pledge saying that he believed in practiced birth control. He openly admitted that population is a problem. The point that Commoner makes in his book (The Closing Circle) is that the environmental problem is not the result of consuming too much. It is not that there are too many people. The problem is that we have utilized the wrong kinds of technology. Thus, the solution is to concentrate on the board room and not the bedroom. Commoner, who worked diligently in planning the Environmental Forum, mentioned that to achieve the environmental quality attainable by a 30% improvement in technical efficiency, we would have to reduce the population by 85%. Now that will raise your genocidal hackles pretty fast. Nobody, of course, was proposing such a reduction. But, when you want to make a point, you can always make your point best if you use a reductionist argument; it is usually the most convincing. There is a price you pay for it, of course, but nevertheless, there is a real value to that. Needless to say, many of the people attending from Third World nations (some of them were working and teaching in the United States) said, "Right on Barry, that's exactly the way we see it too." Some people believed there was some kind of plot devised beforehand between Commoner and the Third World spokesmen. Nevertheless, it was very clear, that Commoner strongly opposed all of those people who were trying to promote birth control (or genocidal practices) among poor people.

At the end of the first week, Paul Ehrlich, fortunately or unfortunately, was invited to give a presentation. He flew in for one of the sessions, and soon found himself on a platform shared, not by his request, with many Third World representatives. Whether they teach in the United States or not to me is irrelevant because I think that they offered a genuine statement of the militant views of Third World people. It was definitely not a view of the UN delegates from Third World nations, but I think we can understand the differences. The UN delegates are among that small minority in Third World nations who are the recipients, the beneficiaries of industrial development. We should never forget this as we evaluate their political philosophies.

Ehrlich began to make apologies for The Population Bomb, and admitted that he had made a lot of mistakes.

They crucified him for his early statements on the need to impose population control programs on the Third World (The Population Bomb). Ehrlich's comment was: "The United States government is too irresponsible to impose any program on anyone." That provoked another question: "Suppose the U.S. were responsible?" Well, that was a different issue, but his retraction did not lessen the attacks, for he seemed to be the new whipping boy. Part of it was the conflicts between Barry Commoner and himself. One of the panelists, from Kenya, read a passage from Ehrlich's new book Population, Resources and Environment - a very excellent piece of work which I think is a quantum jump improvement beyond The Population Bomb. It was a choice passage which Ehrlich is undoubtedly sorry he ever wrote, saying that Kenya should not be allowed to develop, but should purchase its manufactured products from industrialized nations. Furthermore, Kenya should maintain its game preserves as a tourist attraction where weary citizens from industrial societies can go for rest and relaxation. Predictably, the people from Kenya did not dig that solution. They felt that it should be a game preserve (and maybe it should be) but it is not going to be done by fiat by Western sociologists, scientists or politicians. In that passage Ehrlich seemed to miss completely what the dependency relations are and how they are integral to the development debate.

Now again let me say that I think Ehrlich's books, How To Be A Survivor and Population, Resources and Environment, are considerable improvements over the first. Now Ehrlich's thesis is right. That is, if you have a multiplying effect causing pollution you have to deal with consumption level, you have to deal with population, and you have to deal with the kinds of technology that Commoner deals with. Compare the Ehrlich/Commoner debate in Environment magazine and the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. I frankly think that Ehrlich makes a convincing case: You just cannot deal with one variable. You cannot resort to a reductionist model. But unfortunately, the ad hominem aspects came in against Ehrlich. Many of the Third World delegates and participants in Stockholm admitted that population was a problem, but they claimed that it was a self-correcting problem via more development. That is, the higher the standard of living, the lower the population rate.

Now it did not have much impact to say that the United States (even with its current low birth rate) produces a lot of children that consume and pollute too much, or that the average American consumes and pollutes 25 to 100 times as much as the average Indian. Hence, each American born to a middle-class family is an environmental menace. We have to understand this. Slowing down birth rates is just one solution to part of the problem.

Third World people were not looking to the developed nations for their solutions. They repeatedly charged that United States' foreign aid had been diverted from development to population control programs. They were also highly resentful of reports funded by the Rockefeller brothers bemoaning the population explosion in the poor nations. "It's really your fumes, not our people, that cause pollution." This seemed to be a recurring theme echoed by many of the people present. But is that not typical of the kind of reaction that you get when you talk with Chicanos, Puerto Ricanos, or black Americans in terms of birth control? The issue is really not birth control. It is much more profound, and we have to understand that, if we want to take population control seriously. Third World people also opposed new stipulations at the World Bank that would favor, through its loan programs, nations that have effective birth control programs. All the statements on population equilibrium, optimum population, and especially reduced population were refuted by Third World spokesmen. Well aware of the current power alignments, one person said, "If population is reduced by 50%, we know which half is going." I think we have to consider that seriously. Fred Smith has a comment that he likes to use about the inequitable sharing of environmental amenities. He calls it "Smitty's Law" that says, "If things could be made unequal, they will be." That is pretty much of a Hobbesian or at least Christian view of the sin in man, but I think we have to understand this reality as it manifests itself in political institutions. Long live Reinhold Niebuhr and his understanding of man's corruptibility.

Unfortunately there was so much invective, ideological rambling and inept defense by population controllers of their position - particularly in understanding the political dynamics - that the population issues were not adequately discussed anywhere in Stockholm. Even though they came up many times, I don't think they received an adequate treatment. The naive political stance of many of the population controllers was justly criticized by the Third World participants. By "naive stance", I am talking about the kind of solution which requires a totalitarian form of government to implement it. Yet the people proposing those solutions were insensitive and unaware of the political dimensions. In their reaction the more extreme Third World spokesmen erroneously spoke of the population explosion as a non-problem. At least that is what they said in public. In private they said, "Well, maybe there is a problem, let's talk about it." The population issue boiled down to something that F-M-N and any group seriously concerned about population stability has to understand: the population problem of the Third World (whether it is the Third World abroad, or the Third World at home) must be defined by the Third World itself. No program designed by the affluent can be successfully superimposed on the non-affluent without severe repercussions and ultimately failure. The Third World representatives were more than willing to discuss population control among themselves, for instance, as participants at the Pan-African population control conference prior to Stockholm. But you would never notice that sensitivity from the kinds of exchanges that took place at the Stockholm meeting. So the real question of population is "Who says what, to whom, and in what context?" That may be a legitimate way of getting at the population issue. If one wants to build bridges between the advocates of environmental quality and promoters of social justice, the population issue is definitely not the place to begin. The political implications and past history of population control measures are simply too explosive. Discussions on population must avoid the "haves" telling the "have-nots" to have fewer children. And this seemed to be the dominant motif.

I remember talking to Beulah Sanderson and Jonnie Tillman of the National Welfare Rights Organization about birth control. Both said that the government is reluctant to have NWRO distribute birth control information in their own communities. The government feels safer with the Planned Parenthood organization. Yet there is no question about who has better credibility and who can be more effective in getting people to use birth control measures. Such efforts planned by the U.S. for others are seen as genocidal and are ultimately self-defeating, if we really desire to curb population growth. Population control efforts among the poor, at home and abroad, will be much more effective if the poor themselves think population is a problem, and are provided with the means necessary to enact the programs they deem necessary. Let me repeat - "Who says what, to whom, and in what context?" That is the message I got in Stockholm regarding population control.

(2) Now the second issue dramatized at the Stockholm meetings is what I call the "doomsday reports." These are not messages of abject hopelessness, but warnings that if current trends are not reversed, eco-catastrophe will result. Specifically, I am referring to presentations made on the Club of Rome's The Limits to Growth and the British (Ecologist) Blueprint for Survival; two documents, which if you are not familiar with, you certainly should read. Although the environmentalists from the industrialized nations applauded vigorously, both reports were negatively received by the Third World representatives and many pro-leftists from industrialized nations. There were many Swedes there, for example, who were no happier with the Blueprint for Survival or The Limits to Growth, than were the people from the Third World. One's appraisal of the reports had to do with one's political ideology.

As an American accustomed to the Keynesian economists attacking The Limits to Growth, it was comforting to find out that it is really a capitalist document. That is exactly what it was accused of being. I have never seen it quite that way, and the capitalists we at BIM talk with do not see it as a capitalist document either. But, nevertheless, it was refreshing to hear new attacks on The

Limits to Growth from the other side, rather than reading the New York Times review on how economic growth is really wonderful, and how more growth is even better. The M.I.T. document was an elitist, technocratic plot that is supportive of a corrupt and imperialistic capitalistic system. That assessment is not free of rhetoric, but it was the kind of rhetoric that was very much in the Stockholm air. The Limits to Growth, they said, was not concerned with social justice, but alluded to redistribution solely as an afterthought. In this regard I fully agree with them. I do not think you can talk seriously about eco-justice, and then wait until page 117 to hint at the need for redistribution, particularly if we acknowledge that the number one social problem is economic inequality.

I talked with M.I.T. co-authors Jorgen Randers and Bill Behrens about this elitist charge. Bill Behrens told me recently that he has been so upset by such charges and with being a computer technocrat that he refuses to use flow diagrams when speaking to a group if they hinder the communications. (Jay Forrester, incidentally has not had that conversion yet). But Behrens has been so disturbed about the way The Limits to Growth has been treated as a tract by technocratic elites trying to pull a fast one on the unsuspecting public, that he is even willing to sacrifice the computer - and at M.I.T. that is an unbelievable sacrifice! That is how committed he is to the issues, not only to a computer method and technique.

Thus, I think we can say something positive about the people who put together The Limits to Growth.

Many of the attacks on them came from pro-Marxists who were critical of any notion of natural limits, because it reveals so little faith in technology. That criticism is not unlike that of the Keynesians. Incidentally, many of the old-fashioned Marxists and the new-fashioned Keynesians are cut out of the same cloth of economic growth. There are some real differences on the distribution of the fruits of production, but you know Lenin spoke voluminously about the electrification process and the virtues of industry. The Soviets today have a great mystique about technology, even more than the U.S. Some claim that Russian citizens are even greater technophiliacs than Americans. Many critics were as anti-Limits to Growth as the earlier Marxists were anti-Malthusian. Do you remember their arguments? It seemed that The Limits to Growth people are the new Malthusians.

The critics, however, seemed to be unaware of the vicious attacks made by capitalists on The Limits to Growth in the United States. As mentioned, we have been trying to get businessmen in Boston to take it seriously (even half seriously) and if Limits is a defense of our economic system - most of them "ain't" interpreting it like that now.

From the standpoint of the actual structural analysis, the Third World people were right. The charge can be legitimately made that you cannot abstract yourself from reality (as mentioned in my opening comments) and picture yourself as the master planner putting the world back together because no one else knows how. But these charges are open to debate. A few weeks ago I had a discussion with Randers on this point, and he still thinks my appraisal is unfair.

The case for The Limits to Growth and the Blueprint for Survival at Stockholm was not assisted by the presentations made on their behalf. Those who were there know what I mean. The Limits to Growth was presented by a member of the Club of Rome board, not by the staff technicians who developed and understand the model. There was no passion or real concern for social justice. Overall, the ideas suffered from a poor presentation.

Blueprint for Survival was something else. I found out later that the Ecologist group who sponsored it is divided into two camps: the New Left in England, which is a fairly radical new Marxist group, and the old line aristocrats of the Ezra Mishan variety who basically do not like the idea of all those poor and working class people getting those amenities that only the upper classes should have. Now I did not believe this myth, of course, until I heard Mr. Goldsmith (one of the co-authors of A Blueprint for Survival) present his case. My view of the Blueprint dropped almost instantaneously after hearing him, like watching the New England Patriots play on a Sunday afternoon. He spoke of the need for the enlightened few planning for the unenlightened many, which seemed to be Goldsmith's central theme. There happen to be fewer bright people than there are uninformed and stupid people, so the few bright people ought to plan for the others. Now that is a caricature to be sure, but not much of one. Many of us were upset about his presentation because we felt the whole issue of steady-state or equilibrium economics was going down the tubes. Goldsmith's remarks and style made it impossible to open an intelligent discussion. Herman Daly, an economist who has written eloquently on the steady-state economy said to me, "Oh my God, after this, we'll never be able to talk about equilibrium economics to anyone." Goldsmith used an illustration that I want to repeat, because it was symbolic of the way he communicated. He said, "All of this petty bickering over ideological differences (distribution) annoys me. It reminds me of a ship heading toward an iceberg. The captain of the ship is trying to get people to change the course, but the galley slaves - the people below decks - insist on fighting to see who's going to man the oars." (paraphrase). Now that illustration spoke for itself. It was so bad, I felt like crawling under the chair because I had recommended that people read Blueprint for Survival, and even passed out copies. But this is one of those things we have to understand. If many of the ecological viewpoints are interpreted as elitist positions, it is because they are presented by people who are elitists. I think Goldsmith's remarks at an international forum came through precisely like that.

Goldsmith went home early; real dialogue was impossible. Daly and others really tried to come to grips with this issue. How do we deal with the steady-state issue and not just break up into two armed camps? We did not succeed. All the representatives from the Third World (ranging from radicals teaching in the U.S. to the less radical who were UN delegates) shared the same concerns. All vigorously opposed any scheme that would freeze the poor at their current level of inequality. If limits to economic growth are needed because of ecological constraints, then environmental quality must not be achieved at the expense of the already oppressed peoples. Underdevelopment, not over-development, is their problem. This theme kept coming up over and over again.

By the end of two weeks, one thing that became clear was that the growth/no-growth framework is a very unhelpful formulation of a complex problem. I, for one, am increasingly disturbed with talking about whether we should have economic growth or not. One would think that a particular indicator on a piece of paper were the problem, rather than pollution or the resource depletion that it symbolized. Economic growth is a score card for certain physical realities and transactions. It can occur in polluting or nonpolluting sectors. It seems clear that unless there are some marvelous technical fixes, economic growth in the polluting sector will have to be slowed down. But there are a variety of other ways that economic growth can be achieved. It is not whether an economy grows or stagnates; the crucial question is: Can it grow in harmony with the limits of the natural resources and the ability of the biosphere to absorb pollution? In other words, what kind of economic growth is the issue that has to be faced and understood.

The positive role that economic growth has played in many societies cannot be overlook or minimized. It is true that economic growth does not always bring justice, as seen in the numerous instances where industrialization has actually widened rather than narrowed the gap between the rich and the poor. But in most societies economic growth has been a precondition for social welfare. In other words, the socialization of poverty does not quite come to grips with the question of distributive justice or quality of life for all. The social, economic and political structures would have to be radically transformed in order for social justice to be attained in a society of no economic growth or economic equilibrium. Such transformations, if possible at all politically, are not about to occur before the next twenty years. Hence, redistribution should never be spoken of glibly as if it were something easy to achieve. Nevertheless, the necessity of moving toward an economic equilibrium in harmony with ecological limits cannot be ignored either. We have to combine these or fuse them together.

Above all, the redistribution issue and its problems cannot be considered simply as an afterthought. It does not do any good to have good intentions about the poor and bring them up on page 117 of a 150 page book. It must be dealt with as an integral part of all serious ecological discussions.

I think the conclusions of The Limits to Growth and Blueprint for Survival are essentially correct. All of us need to learn to deal with natural limits and plan accordingly. The Marxist analysis also needs to be updated and those with left wing orientations, like myself, have to bring Marx up to date and liberate the analysis from a technical optimism that is characteristic of all industrialized societies whether they be communist, capitalist or socialist. It is the mode of technical optimism that is being challenged.

(3) The third area I want to explore is the links between social justice and ecology issues as they came up in other ways in Stockholm. One reality that became evident at the United Nations conference (and other conferences) was that ecology cannot be lifted up beyond politics simply because some industrialized nations deem it the most pressing issue. For the Third World nations in Stockholm, "development" and "environmental quality" were not used interchangeably. For many nations the real

ecological problem is the lack of development or the persistence of poverty. They are skeptical of the environmental issues because they see them as diversions from other burning social concerns. They made it repeatedly clear all over Stockholm, that they will not accept any notion about limits to growth if such measures work to fix the present levels of injustice.

A few things came up in the UN meetings that I think are very crucial, particularly with regard to the position of the U.S. government. One was that UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) and GATT (General Agreements on Trade and Tariffs) do a feasibility study to find out whether we should replace the synthetics that DuPont and others make with natural fibers. That proposal was a way of killing two birds with one stone. You help the development of a poor nation which the advent of synthetics has retarded. And you also help in the ecological crisis by getting rid of the most polluting technologies, very much in line with the Commoner thesis. In a subcommittee at the United Nations conference, the vote on doing the feasibility study, not adopting it as a practice mind you, was 57 to 1. Guess who was the one minority? - the United States delegation.

Another item that came up had to do with compensatory payments. For instance, suppose we start recycling our beer cans and do not buy any more bauxite ore from the Andean or Caribbean nations. What are their economies to do since much of their revenues depend upon the sale of these materials to the more affluent societies? The suggestion was made that environmental quality at home should not be achieved at the expense of poor nations, so therefore there should be a compensatory payment. If you improve your environment at home, you give a certain amount of money to the country that absorbs the loss. The vote on that was 62 to 4. The United States delegates got its buddies from three nations to join them. You begin to see where we are at in terms of American orientation in the ecological crisis. It became painfully apparent that it was a mistake to assume the U.S. and other industrialized nations saw ecology as a top priority.

As a result of Stockholm, many of the fears of Third World people (the delegates in particular) that environment would be a cop-out on the poor were somewhat allayed. This was perhaps the most positive thing that came out of Stockholm. Prior to Stockholm, many of the people from the Third World feared that the rich nations would divert money now being earmarked for foreign aid to international environmental control programs. They feared that trade would be restricted because of the adoption of recycling practices in the rich nations, who, as mentioned above, would therefore purchase fewer raw materials. They also feared that new pollution control measures in rich nations would do much to increase the product prices. Therefore, the poor nations just could not afford these new technologies or products. Finally, they were afraid that if the industrial countries adopted the new and rigid pollution control standards and the corporations did not want to pay the price for it, they would simply move abroad with their multi-national firms and transfer the pollution to others. In other words, we'll do to them what we can't do at home in industrialized nations.

These were legitimate concerns and I can honestly say that many of these concerns were allayed in the work done prior to Stockholm especially by Maurice Strong, as well as at the conference. Admittedly, it is a far cry from dealing with global equilibrium, or dealing with viable solutions to the population explosion, or even dealing with the equitable distribution of resources. But nevertheless, I think it could be said that something good really did happen - a positive first step.

The concerns for social justice, the limits of natural resources, the limits of the biosphere to absorb pollution, the long range effects of exponential growth of rich nations on global ecology (coupled with the dynamic processes of technological - economic domination of trade by the rich) - these are the substantive issues that were not really taken seriously at the United Nations conference. For the industrial nations had already made their positions very clear in Santiago, Chile several months earlier at the 3rd conference of UNCTAD. Their position there was simply this, "We know our technology is making you poor. The solution to that is, you've just got to keep buying that technology from us." Few concessions were made that would help to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor nations.

Let us look now at one last thing connected with this third point. What about the emulation of the American life style by the poor nations? More and more I was convinced that Third World delegates were saying that the American dream could not be emulated in their nations, even if they desired it. Some of them even said it should not be emulated because what they needed was a technology that was proportional to their concerns. Without question, the most imaginative statement I heard on technology for people was made by the Chinese delegates at two meetings where they talked about a "people's technology" - i.e., not adjusting people to technical change, which seems to be the hang-up in the western countries, but designing a technology around where people are at. If this means drops in productivity or a slow rise in GNP, so be it. A nation should accept a lower productivity if it means fewer social problems. In other words, the backyard steel furnaces, as one delegate said, did not increase the productivity in steel manufacturing, but it increased the ultimate overall productivity of the Chinese people by orienting them to industrial processes. It was clear that we have to develop new kinds of technological models. But it was not very clear what these models would look like. Nevertheless, they called for an accommodation between economic development, social justice and the environmental quality. That is essentially the way to plan development programs.

Concluding Note

Now with regard to the theme of this conference, I could not help but be struck by something that Lynn White said in 1967. He remarked - wrongly - that Christianity was the cause of the ecological crisis, but - rightly - that religious views or fundamental values are at the heart of the ecological crisis. This became clear in Stockholm at all meetings.

Let me offer another illustration. One of my friends just got back from an O.E.C.D. meeting in Paris. O.E.C.D. is an economic development group. It was very interesting that at the outset of the conference they outlawed any value or philosophical discussions because they wanted to really deal with hard-nosed issues of "technology transfer." My friend said that despite their efforts, every comment was value-laden, either implictly or explicitly, because the questions kept coming up repeatedly: development for whom? For what purpose? For what end? Yet these are the technocrats who did not want to deal with value discussions. As one said, "We have to deal with values because we can't build our plants unless we deal with them."

It became apparent at Stockholm that the fundamental value structure in industrialization and the traditional mythologies about economic growth ultimately resolving everybody's problems were being rightfully challenged.

They simply have not worked effectively. It was frequently mentioned in Stockholm that the bottom 40% in the poor nations are worse off after a good deal of industrial development than they were before the whole process started. Some people of course, are better off, others are untouched. The ruling class obviously is helped, but the bottom 40% is often hurt by increases in per capita income and increases in gross national product. In many of his speeches, Robert McNamara, of the World Bank, (not of leftist origins, given his former occupation) echoed statistics about the 40% of the people in growing countries (not those that are stagnating) who are actually not helped by development. Hence, there is a call for new models of development, - the realization that somehow we really have to start putting the industrial system together in a different way. How to do it and how to get there from here is a little more problematic.

I want to suggest three things as the task of the religious institutions. Admittedly, I see things in the trinitarian form, probably due to my homiletic training! One of the things that became evident at Stockholm was the need to understand the dynamics of the ecological crisis and global poverty along with interrelationships. I am talking about the structural dynamics of pollution and poverty. It is not accidental that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer; the market system is designed to do exactly that. The surprise is not the Alliance for Progress has not worked, it was designed to help the "haves". Of course, it is important to deal truthfully with the symptoms of either ecology or poverty. Nevertheless, we have to get to the roots and recognize that we must understand the structural analysis. Many perceptual changes and changes of consciousness are needed among the global constituency that have to precede the building of a new kind of industrial order.

The second point I would suggest to religious institutions is the need to develop alternative visions of what a new global development would look like, if it were designed to maximize social justice, and environmental responsibility and not to maximize profits for a few. It is really irrelevant, incidentally, whether that "few" be those in privately owned capitalism or state-owned capitalism, as in some socialist nations. Building alternatives is an extremely difficult task because there are so few models available. We have had an industrial progress for two hundred years now, at least one hundred years of solid industrialization developing in one style. It is imperative that we understand and learn from experiences in Tanzania, Peoples Republic of China, Ceylon, Cuba. Incidentally, some of these nations have been at times deemed our enemies. All these nations that are experimenting with new forms of social and industrial organization do so without romanticizing them, and we should study their experiences. New visions of economic equality and environmental quality are needed. They can provide new cultural symbols - a new universe of meaning other than GNP and material standard of living. New models of industrial development are crying to be born.

Thirdly, unless visions of a new industrial order are translated into social policy (at least in part), they soon become illusions. Hence, we have to deal with the question: How do we get there from here? Whether or not we like the starting point is really irrel vant. A real Incarnational ethic demands that we take social policy seriously. Beginning at where we are at is the only starting place available to us. Our ideas or new vision must have houses to live in.

I have tried to lay out some perceptions, some major issues and finally some clues as to what religious institutions can do. In a word, these were the great needs and issues as I saw them in Stockholm. They have to be taken seriously if we really want a religious reconstruction for the future of our children and their environment.

FMN/OEE WORKSHOP
30NOV-2DEC'72
STORRS, CT.

Native Wholeness*

J.W.E. Newbery

"Religion and the Humanizing of Man". So to speak implies a quality which man for all his other accomplishments has failed to achieve or else it must mean that he has lost it.

What does it mean to be human? The answers so often given dwell upon man's differences from the rest of creation. He is "homo sapiens", "homo faber", "homo ludens", "homo negans" (as Walter Kasper said) and to say so is to define him in contrast with other creatures. Eric Fromm (in "The Revolution of Hope") says this is inadequate. Man is not man because he stands in a different relationship to nature from other creatures but in that he is not bound in his relationship as they are by law and instinct. He is free to recognize it as proper and to choose it. I suppose this is what Abraham Heschel meant when he said that the opposite of the human is not the animal (it is the demonic).

Thus I would seek for a definition of man which recognized his relationship to the rest of nature as properly one of wholeness and interdependence, which recognizes his ability to choose this relationship of integration and responsibility, and his loyalty to it as a primary obligation.

---

*A paper read originally at the International Congress of Learned Societies in Religion, Los Angeles, September 1972. (General theme: "Religion and the Humanizing of Man")

There is a deep concern about humanness today and it is no coincidence that there is also a deep concern about all life on this planet. The one has grown out of the other. Man has in his day of power thought of himself as standing over against the rest of creation, in a large measure independent of it or unresponsible for it. There has been thus little restraint on his will to exploit nature for his ends and to manipulate it as his power permits. He no longer feels his unity with other creatures - even with his fellow men. He does not sense the hurt he is inflicting everywhere on the rocks and soil, the waters, the air, animals and man. His world he has fragmented. Wholeness has been destroyed and when the "sacred hoop" (as our native people used to speak of it) has been broken, everything begins to fall apart and die.

We have called what has been going on "progress". But it strikes us now with shock that it has turned out to be the very opposite; that "bigger is not better"; that "faster may be slower" and that "less may well mean more".

At this critical stage in the human story, many are looking seriously at what we have condescendingly called the primitive societies of the past. The critique of "progress" being made by such European scholars as Martin Lings and Frithjof Schuon involves the rejection of evolution and the linear view of history now so familiar to us in the West, and the foundation of our progress obsession, and a return to the cyclic and devolutionary views of the East. Lings says, in relation to our time:

> "All religions agree that we are passing through the final stages of one of the great cosmic cycles. The end of the cycle means that the possibilities which were contained within it from its beginning have reached the extremity of their development - that is, their extremity of separation from the principle. Such a period is one of remoteness from God and one of its necessary characteristics is a world largely peopled by men and women who have no consciousness of man's true nature and responsibility".[1]

Men and women today, and especially the young, are sensing the fundamental wisdom of the past in relation to the problems that now beset us. In systems such as Taoism, Hinduism, Buddhism and in tribal religions generally they recognize an understanding of man's relationship with his world, of his true nature and responsibility in it, now sadly lacking among us. And their nostalgia is possibly the starting point of a new cycle in the human story.

My special concern in this paper is for the relationship of this situation in which we find ourselves, to the culture of our own native people on this continent. I quote the words of Professor Joseph Epes Brown, which inspired me years ago when I first read them. He said:

> "Especially among the Indians on the prairies, I found qualities and degrees of spirituality rarely found in the world today and for want of which the modern world is becoming impoverished in spite of its material wealth".

---

[1] Studies in Comparative Religion, Winter 1970, pg. 21

The world view of those people encountered in the 16th, 17th, 18th and 19th centuries by incoming explorers, traders, colonists and missionaries was a "holistic" one. And this wholeness was a spiritual phenomenon. For it was spirit which gave life to all creatures, human and other-than-human, and could give life to anything, even what we would call an inanimate thing. All things have, or can have, their spirits and all spirits are gathered up into the One Spirit, the "Great Mystery". Thus all things are members of a community of spirit.

Professor Brown says:

> "The lofty wisdom of the old Indian Priest is often obscured for us by the unique character of his traditions, by his polysynthetic genius, in which great importance is placed on all the various aspects of the world of nature. But throughout this affirmation and use of the many forms of nature (sun, eagle, buffalo, cardinal points, circle, tree, pipe, etc.), there is always to be found the idea of divine unity and divine transcendence. The Indian is thus not a pagan or an idolator, but knows that the divine spirit is infinite and thus included within himself all possibilities so that all forms are functions or reflections of him who in his essence is always One".

The consequence of this world view was at every step a life of respect, sensitiveness and responsibility. To catch a fish, to cut a tree, to kill an animal was an act not to be undertaken thoughtlessly. Norval Morriseau, an Ojibway Indian and a gifted artist at Sandy Lake, Ontario, tells of a bear that took to scavenging in a garbage dump near his home. His wife, fearful that the children might be harmed, insisted that he kill it. As is the manner of wives, she had her way. But after the animal had been shot, Morriseau spoke to it: "I didn't want to kill you", he said, "but I had to do it."

In the Community Church in New York City there is an eloquent statue of an Indian man lifting up - its great wings outspread - an eagle he has killed to gain its powers. And on the statue is the prayer, "Eagle spirit forgive me". Margaret Craven in her beautiful book, "I Heard the Owl Call My Name" describes a Kwakuitl woman going to gather bark from a cedar tree. She addressed the tree: "I will not leave you naked. I only want a little of your bark to make a mat and blanket for my baby." Diamond Jenness reports an Ojibway Indian on Parry Island telling him that even the most trivial acts are touched by the awareness of indwelling spirit, so that ideally even an armful of wood will not be carelessly thrown down or a hat tossed into a corner, but will be carefully piled or hung upon a peg.

We may better appreciate this view in native life if we consider four of its more fundamental expressions.

The first is Vision. A few miles from my home, on the north shore of Georgian Bay is an impressive outcropping of quartzite rock which, as a series of islands, ages ago stood above the floods of waters released by the melting of the last great ice cap. One of these commanding a breath-taking view of land and water, is known as "Dreamers Rock". There, up to comparatively recent times, Indian boys were sent at puberty to fast and pray and wait for their vision. The dream when it came, with its glimpse into the spirit world, with its song, its new name, its sacred object, its assurance of a guardian spirit, was an experience of vocation. It was the child's own personal assurance of his place in the community of spirit. It lifted him into responsible manhood.

This leads to the concept of Power in Indian life. Power is a matter of spirit. It issues from one's acceptance into that world, confirmed by possession of the powerful object, the song, or name given and the guardian spirit vouchsafed. The disclosure held the quality of secrecy: a private, personal equipping of the person for his life of action. The need for power in that exposed and often threatened and precarious life led to the oft-repeated recourse to vision quest, so that some commentators have spoken of native life as "dream-ridden".

The third concept is Holiness or wholeness. It is utterly important for the community and for the individual to retain connection with the spirit world at all times, to preserve unbroken the wholeness of the relationship represented in the circle or sacred hoop. This was the meaning of the sacred pipe and the dances, especially the

Sun Dance. Frithjof Schuon observed of the immensely significant pipe ceremony: "The entire creation prays with the man who offers the pipe to the powers or to the Power".

The dances were ways of repairing and cementing the bonds which unite in spirit the world of creatures and of bringing back wholeness and healing. A Mohawk spiritual leader visiting our university recently invited us all to join in the "Fish Dance". He began by alluding to the pollution poisoning affecting the fish in our waters. "We will do this dance", he said, "for the healing of our brothers, the fish." But the Sun Dance, when properly performed, is the act of wholling par excellence. By its highly dramatic and powerful ceremony the firm binding of the community to the powers is sought and of it the binding together of the scattered communities of the people is by-product.

Fourth in this series of expressions is Freedom. A sociologist who has worked for some years in Indian Communities tells me that the question "What does it mean to be an Indian?" frequently brings the answer, "It means to be free." An Indian friend of mine, even now, continually frets over the restrictions in white society. Undoubtedly the quality of freedom is written deep in native life. And thus, one can understand the wound to the spirit inflicted by the restrictions imposed by colonization and the reservations and the white man's laws. The Indian man, within the community of nature and under the commands of his spirit powers responded immediately, whole-heartedly and often shatteringly to the challenges presented to him. Chief Poundmaker said it was like trying to make oxen of wild deer to shut his people up in reserves under foreign restrictions. Poundmaker himself did not long survive his years of imprisonment for alleged implication in the Riel rebellion.

I have already hinted at the treatment given this view of the world and this style of life by incoming European traders, colonists and missionaries and the governments they formed. We need to remember that these people came here under the thrall of the Renaissance and ideas of evolution and progress which would soon become almost a new religion in European thought; that they came from lands which would be more and more involved in industrialization with its growing demands for materials and markets, with its creeping individualism and consequent fragmentation of life; that they came in a spirit of high evangelism out of the atmosphere of the Reformation and Counter-reformation. Perhaps what happened was inevitable. But of the consequences Frithjof Schuon says:

> "The conscious, calculated, methodical, official and by no means anonymous destruction of the Red Race, its traditions and culture in North America and partly also South America, far from

> having been an unavoidable process...certainly remains one of the greatest crimes and most notable vandalism of all human history".[2]

It is clear that the denial of these insights, the treatment of them as paganism, the proscription of their expression as savagery, the forbidding of the native language in the schools, the isolation of the people in reserves, the destruction of the traditional means of livelihood without providing new ones, the intention of assimilation, plus a thousand insults and deceptions, have reduced the native man from the integrity and nobility of his pre-contact life to the state of withdrawal and apathy and bitterness which have become his stereotype today. Father Cochin, reflecting on the death of Poundmaker, confessed not only for the Church but for the whole white contact, economic, political and religious, when he said: "We came to bring them a better way of life. But I fear we have destroyed them instead".

Not quite! John Collier began his book on "The Indians of the Americas" with the words: "The Indian had what the world needs. He has it now". Deep into the unconscious though they may have been driven, the ancient insights survive and have maintained their influence in Indian character. That is why the Indian in general has not been able to assimilate, why he has never been able to find his spiritual home in Christianity, why he has not ceased to nurse the loss of his language and culture. The spark has continued to smolder. Today it is beginning to catch fire again.

---

[2] Light from the Ancient Worlds, pg. 85

But this is a day also, of great confusion in the Indian spirit. An Indian friend just returned from a visit to the northern settlement in Ontario, speaks of the "total social disintegration" there. Harold Cardinal, a recognized Canadian leader notes spiritual death. "Our people no longer believe", he says, "it is that simple and it is that sad". Yet traditional spiritual leaders are coming forward again to revive the old faith. At the same time, the Churches are increasing their bid for the native soul by the introduction of Indian language and ceremony into their services while fundamentalist sects appeal with the emotionalism of "old time" religion. Today also Red Power with strong arguments tears at the heart of a people attuned to another life style than that. The adult-to-elderly segment of Indian society, once the age of wisdom and counsel, is caught between those of the younger generation who say, "Come back to the old ways" and those who say, "Come forward to the world of pressure groups and politics". In all this, the real battleground remains a spiritual one. And it is to this point that my final remarks will be made.

But first two questions. Native insights into man's relationship with his world being, as we have suggested, so directly related to the ecological crisis of our time, what is the possibility and what the nature of help reaching us from this source? In answer to the first question, an Indian Chief said not long ago, "I don't think the Indian is interested in pulling the White man's chestnuts out of the fire". And when I suggested that the chestnuts of all of us are in the fire together, he replied, "We know how to take care of ourselves. We can survive long after you".

As to the second question I must say I have a deep sense of sympathy for traditional Indian groups who read the signs of the times and literally want to draw back to the old ways. It may be true, as a native sociologist at the University of Saskatchewan said the other day, that "backward will prove to be forward". But Chief Dan George was surely right when he spoke against a return to the bow and arrow age. "These quivers are empty", he said, "what served us then can never serve us again. Nevertheless the spirit that made the past strong was a true spirit and must be freed and heard again". It is to this point that I address my final words. To begin with, I quote the half-hearted confession of a Jesuit priest:

> "One must be careful before condemning a thousand things among their customs, which greatly offend minds brought-up and nourished in another world. It is easy to call irreligion what is mere stupidity and to take for diabolcal working something that is no more than human. And then one thinks he is obliged to forbid as impious certain things that are done in

> innocence...I have no hesitation in saying that we have been too severe on this point."[3]

Note that there is here no recognition of real worth in the native insights. Indian ways are still at best only innocence, and if less than that they are stupidity. Neither is there any coming to grips with the real problem in the Canadian Catholic Bishops' recent suggestion that the Indian languages be used in the Mass and the dances permitted in Christian ceremonies. This, it appears, is merely an attractive fringe to be added to creeds and dogmas which themselves remain unchanged. When the Anglican Church in Canada made a small grant recently to an Indian cultural project concerned with language study, to the native acknowledgement of the grant was added the explanation, "the Church's concern is with its own translations". This was intended to mean, I suppose, that the Church made the grant for its own sake and not for the worth of the culture itself. Such small tokens are seen as institutional concessions and amount to very little. What is required is a repentant recognition on the part of the Church that native insights were and are genuinely religious ones. They are not foreign but actually basic to the Christian gospel itself, and must be confessed and given expression again.

Some in the Church today are striving manfully to develop a theology of ecology. They note an over-reaction in the Old Testament to the dangers of the Nature religions.

---

[3] Paul Raquereau S.J., "The Musket and the Cross", pg. 54

So-called "process theology" is called upon to check the strenuous transcendentalism of neo-orthodoxy and to indicate the realities of divine immanence. They recognize the fateful error of the Judaeo-Christian tradition in mistaking holiness as the exact opposite of wholeness. They see the miraculous as interaction in an open universe of nature, man and God. They understand the "Kingdom of God" as the just and gracious rule of divine life throughout the Universe, so that "not one sparrow falls to the earth without the Father", as a rule wherein man's special responsibility in the universe is continually being called into judgement by the condition of his fellow creatures.

If we take these efforts seriously we can see that here are the very truths our native people were confessing and expressing in their own way when western man came to these shores. But western Christianity with its dualisms, its almost exclusive transcendentalism, its concept of fallen nature and its historic institutions was blind to the meaning of what it saw, and it overwhelmed and silenced the confession of the native spirit. One of the saddest things I ever heard is the tremulous complaint of an old, brainwashed native lay preacher in a far northern Indian settlement trying vainly to maintain the Christian institution there. "They say they are Christians," he feebly complained of his people, "but they don't act like Christians. They sing the hymns and bring their children to be baptized and they receive holy communion but the sun is their God and the moon. And they worship the winds and the stars."

I am trying in all this, to say that the ecological and sociological problems with which we are faced demand spiritual as well as technological solutions. For I believe the evidence is growing that they are fundamentally spiritual problems. And in the search for spiritual solutions, I have been thrilled to find the essence of them in the holism of native insights; thrilled too, to find these native to the Christian gospel, though neglected in Christian developments; ashamed that in the confrontation of the Church and the Indian people those insights were in their native expression repudiated. Thus, the exploitation of nature has gone on among us uncondemned.

In summary:

"The root of 'the Indian problem' is spiritual," a knowledgeable Indian friend said to me the other day.

The root of the ecological and sociological problems of our day is spiritual also.

The attitudes which rejected native insights and all but obliterated native culture on this continent are the very same attitudes which have led to the setting of man over against nature as her exploiter and destroyer. They have also set man against fellow-man and so have fragmented human society. And they have separated between man and God, denying creaturehood and responsibility.

The recovery of wholeness (holiness) is a spiritual matter also. Wholeness is fundamental in the Christian gospel as it was and is in the native world view. To recognize this and to set about its recovery will be to bridge the gap between Indian and White in our society. It will restore dignity and power and hope to the native spirit in this moment of its renaissance. It will help our native people to rise above their withdrawal, bitterness, and escapism. It will make an essential contribution, I believe, to a society now seeking a new spirit to guide its technology. It will answer the nostalgia of modern man and especially of young people who have opted out of the modern profit-worshipping society. It will be a long step toward the humanizing of man.

FMN/OEE WORKSHOP
30NOV-2DEC'72
STORRS, CT.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

History and Nature in the Judeo-Christian Tradition: How Will the Future Be Different?

Bernard E. Meland

As our Chairman, Philip Joranson has mentioned, I am assuming the role of a "pinch-hitter" in addressing you today. When I realized that I had but a few days to prepare a paper for the conference on so extensive a theme, I recognized that I would have to content myself with addressing you from within a limited perspective, reflecting more my own response to it, than a critical account of its historical development. When confronted with such a necessity, I suppose it is not unusual for one to reflect initially upon one's own experience with the theme, especially if it has played a decisive role in one's own work and thought. And I would have to acknowledge that this theme has played such a role in my own ruminations through the years. What surfaced in my reflections as an initial idea was the need for exorcising the notion that the Judeo-Christian tradition is to be understood solely as being concerned with history, to the exclusion of an interest in nature; or as being sharply differentiated from nature. That is an assumption I have resisted through the years. When my Modern Man's Worship appeared in 1934, describing man as "an earth creature," and urging that he cultivate a religious sense of being "at home in the universe," an outcry arose among some theologians and members of the clergy against associating such a naturalistic view of man with Christianity. The issue raised by that protest reflects an impasse that has persisted through the years between presentations of the Judeo-Christian legacy as being purely historical, implying a disenchantment with nature, and those concerned with understanding that legacy within a cosmology along with attending its historical development. The impasse here extends to a large section of the Christian community, and accounts in large measure for the Church's divided mind with regard to our human exploitation of nature for scientific and industrial ends, and the problems of ecology now confronting us which, in large measure, follow as a consequence of the anthropocentric myopia that such a restricted historicism tends to encourage. It is with that problem in mind that I have approached this question of history and nature in relation to the Judeo-Christian legacy, feeling that I should say something that would counter the notion that, to think Christianly or to be Christian, one must dissociate oneself from that mood of wholeness, or mode of wholeness, having to do with the natural context of man. So, my remarks are somewhat in the mood of addressing oneself to what Dr. Faramelli mentioned last night - the need for a change of consciousness in many respects before one can be attuned to what is imperative in the issues that are before us. Specifically, it is imperative that a change of consciousness come about with regard to how we understand the Christian tradition before that tradition can be very fruitful in motivating or amplifying efforts among people within the churches in relation to problems of ecology now confronting us.

This theme, HISTORY AND NATURE in the Judeo-Christian Tradition, has so complex a history within Judeo-Christian literature that one would be undertaking a task well nigh impossible were one to try to summarize or to resort to a typological mode of analysis in which a prevailing turn of mind were to be lifted up as being the representative view; one would find it difficult to designate such a representative view concerning history and nature. To be sure, it is possible to disentangle a biblical tradition in early Judaism from the nature-centered faiths contemporary with it, and to see its mythos coming into focus as a covenant relationship between a God of history and his people, thus showing its redemptive theme in that context to be historically oriented, rather than nature-centered. A recent effort of this kind appears in Harvey Cox's The Secular City. That there is such a tradition in Christian thinking, becoming intermittently dominant and persuasive, I would not deny. That it characterized the Christian tradition, I would be less confident. As we noted earlier, it appears to have been initially Hebraic in the sense of opposing the covenant faith of Israel to the nature religions of early biblical times. And whenever that strain of the Judaic-Christian legacy has reappeared in theological discussion, giving singular emphasis to biblical authority in resistance to every other resource in method, Christian thinking has reasserted the historical theme, with a corresponding rejection of the philosophical offerings concerning Christian faith, and a dissociation of theological inquiry from the world of science or any cosmology expressive of the world of nature. But this procedure, I repeat, has been intermittent, not unvaried or consistently pursued in Christian theology. Simply to mention, for example, the Thomistic mode of Christian theology, which must be acknowledged to be representative of a vast portion of the Christian community, would be enough to say that the legacy has been presented differently. For here nature in effect is subsumed under the revelatory and redemptive theme as being expressive of a proving ground within the natural span of life for what is envisaged as an ultimate destiny. Here nature and history tend to coalesce as a space-time complex of distinguishable, though not inseparable, events characterizing the life and history of natural man.

The Protestant interlude through the period of the evangelical awakening can be subsumed under the caption of historical religion in a manner of speaking. Initially, however, the biblical theme of redemption in protestantism was narrowed to comprise a personal act of faith centering in the doctrine of the individual's immediate access to the Holy Spirit, that contrasted with the earlier biblical imagery in which the corporate, rather than the individualized, conception of faith was to the fore. There did follow impressive instances during the early period of the Reformation, both among Lutherans and Calvinist communities as well as among left-wing reform groups, to re-enact the people-of-God drama with its historically oriented concept of a covenant relationship. But when the biblical motif assumed crass proportions of political dominance, the people-of-God motif fragmented into separatist groups motivated largely by the right of private judgment and belief. There is little here to give support to the characterization of Christianity as being distinctly or uniquely attuned to history, though in time as tradition developed among them, there was to emerge what H. Richard Niebuhr has termed "inner history", the story of our lives, though it could be designated the orbit of piety and prejudice as defining the course of their lives.

II.

The zeal for stressing history over against nature as a context for Christian act and decision comes not, I think, from a long standing tradition of interpreting

Christian faith, not even from the biblical tradition; though the latter can be made to seem consonant with such an emphasis. Rather the zeal for stressing the historical dimension of Christianity stems from the romanticist era of liberalism in which the concrete history of a people was set forth as a carrier and conveyor of the universal reality, a view initially set forth by Rousseau and Herder.

This mode of discerning universal reality in concrete historical experience was readily appropriated by an emerging group of Christian theologians, the most eminent, of course, being the German theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher is generally credited with having been the architect of this historical mode of theological structure. His persistent concern with the *sensus numinus*, however, and intermittent attentiveness to developments in the sciences of the period, would suggest that his outreach was inclusive of other dimensions as well. Yet his centering upon the data of the God-consciousness of Christian people, as this became manifest in specific church communities within a given period of historical time, as the area most appropriate for theological inquiry and as defining the bounds of relevant theological discussion, clearly marked his theology as being historically oriented.

But it is in the theology of the Ritschlian school of the 19th century comprising the German theologians

Albrecht Ritschl, Adolph VonHarnack and Wilhelm Herrmann that one first meets the insistent note that Christianity is an historical religion, with explicit caution against involving theological inquiry in matters of philosophy or science. Here history took the form of the acts of men in responding to the inner motivation of the historical Jesus, the norm of all history and the initial impetus toward realizing the kingdom of God within history. Participation in ethical activities responsive to the Christocentric reality in history was, in Ritschl's words, actually to participate in the final redemptive end of the world within this immediate history. Now back of this spirited historical interpretation of the Christian religion were some clearly defined philosophical premises that were taken from the Kantian Critiques and from the transcendental idealism of Hermann Lotze; but we need not go into that aspect of the problem here. Incidentally, the recent theological era of Karl Barth and the Niebuhrs, for all its repudiation of the liberal ethos, could be said to be essentially within the liberal frame of historical experience. The source and mode of its theology, however, was more radically biblical and transcendant, giving to its historically oriented interpretation of Christian faith a decisive and dramatic appeal to norms beyond history, based upon a selective appeal to the biblical faith.

This sketching of the historical emphasis or motif in the Judeo-Christian tradition has been all too cursory to be of use other than to suggest that the emphasis upon history in interpreting the Christian tradition, dissociating it from concern with nature, is an intermittent theme, and is not one that can be said to have characterized it in its entirety. It is a theme that has been lifted up most zealously and persuasively within the liberal and post-liberal period. Now, although my presentation of this theme betrays misgivings concerning the singular emphasis upon history in characterizing the Christian tradition, I do not underestimate the significance of what was achieved in pointing up this dimension of its legacy. The insight into that legacy which emerges from earlier studies by Ritschl and Harnack, not to mention Schleiermacher, along with studies by Bultmann, Niebuhr and other post-liberal theologians, is rich in implication and clarification. What it leaves unsaid, even uncalculated, bearing upon the nature and destiny of man, however, is what renders their presentation of the thrust of this legacy problematic in the present era, with issues of creatureliness relating to the planetary and environmental crisis now to the fore.

It should be noted that a variation upon this liberal mode of presenting the Christian tradition as being exclusively historical had appeared in the Modernist phase of Protestant Liberalism, notably among theologians of the early Chicago School, so called because of their being on the faculty of the University of Chicago, in the nineteen twenties and earlier. Here, as in Shailer Mathews' theology, Christianity was viewed historically as being initially a revolutionary, social movement within Palestine, concerned with giving expression to the teachings of Jesus, and subsequently transformed into a cultic faith of the Church, and later of churches, in which authority and doctrinal conformity assumed dominance. All of this pre-modern rendering of the Christian tradition, Mathews saw as being within the context of history, for the analogies with which beliefs were established and doctrines were formulated, were drawn from the social environment. In the modern period, Mathews argued , both the social and the natural environment entered materially into Christian understanding, since democracy and science provided analogies suitable for establishing meaning in Christian understanding. In this way, Mathews sought to correlate nature and history as sources of understanding within the Christian community.

III.

It may be significant that in the very period in which wider issues of creaturehood have come to the fore in public discussion among various centers of concerned human beings, technical inquiry in theology and religious studies has shifted from a singular preoccupation with historical inquiry to a fresh and insistent look at cosomological issues.

The book that was mentioned a moment ago, Earth Might Be Fair, edited by Ian Barbour, who is here with us, would be a good introduction to that turn of thought now developing, or at least becoming popularly known. It is by no means a new mode of thinking. It is at least thirty years old, but it appears to have become "available" only recently for popular understanding among people of the churches, both Roman Catholic and Protestant. An anthology of process writings along with writings by Teilhard de Chardin has been edited by the Roman Catholic theologian, Ewert H. Cousins[1] who is at Fordham University. And the fact that this has awakened interest both in the Protestant and Roman Catholic segments of theology suggests that it is more than a passing mood. I think one can look for some vigorous developments along re-emphasizing and recovering what could be called a cosmological approach to understanding the life of the spirit.

Now this approach to the problem in itself may give some hint of religious reconstruction for the environmental future and its possible relevance for addressing the general concern. In this more cosmological approach to religious understanding, history is viewed, not as an insular realm of free will and mind, impervious to bodily sense or feeling and to environmental forces or resources, but intimately interrelated and to a high degree, interdependent. The Whiteheadian dictum, "We think with our bodies", thus becomes translated into a contextual understanding of man which extends inquiry beyond his own conscious span of existence to include dimensions of the lived experience that can only be described as cosmic in scope. This reorientation of mind and will in itself could be revolutionary in altering the stance of Christian thinking with regard to the planetary scene as a whole and the environmental situation here at hand as being integral to cultural and religious understanding.

---

[1] Cousins, E.H., Process Theology. New York: Newman Press, 1971. See also, Process Philosophy and Christian Thought. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., Editec by Delwin Brown, Ralph E. James, Jr. and Gene Reeves, 1971.

For a time at least, we need the stimulus of theological inquiry that will look to the correlation of history and nature, not their dissociation. And just as the time of Immanuel Kant was unique in its abundance of insight bearing upon their distinction and dissociation, so our time, reeling under the influx of fresh insights into the processes of nature, both as they bear on the vast planetary conditions of the earth life, and relate to the mystery and condition of our own existing as human beings upon it, is unique in opportunities for understanding our creaturehood and the conditions on earth that are essential to it. There is of course the added dimension of urgency in our time. The time of creaturehood on earth could be running out.

In the excerpt from the address by the Secretary-General at the Stockholm conference quoted in the announcement of our workshop, reference is made to the need for Christians to change. " We must be prepared to learn from men of other faiths who often, more than we, have understood and respected the fragile balance upon which our life depends." I heartily endorse such rapport and interchange with peoples of other faiths, and the attempt to become better informed concerning the legacy of faith that has shaped their cultural identity; but more importantly to share in whatever wisdom that legacy has provided concerning the fragile balance upon which our life depends. I do have misgivings however as to the help such an interchange might yield, particularly as it bears upon the environmental crisis which is now in focus. It is true that other world faiths have in their way been responsive to the mystery of cosmic forces and resources in a way that much of Christianity, with its stress upon history and ethics, tends to ignore. Yet much of this wisdom is in the idiom of the occult, and this is the version of it that is generally made available to Western seekers. Even so, sheer awareness of this depth of mystery environing man's troubled existence has yielded and encouraged a kind of reflection which might yet contribute depth and sensitive awareness to our own Western experience. This fact in itself is what is luring many of the younger generation, commonly referred to as drifters, to the Far East. For they see in this attentiveness a mode of awareness which, in their experiences, has seemed nonexistent in the West and which, except for isolated instances among saints and mystics, the Christian religion has tended to repudiate. I should encourage rapport with such an open awareness and with people responsive to it, yet seek understanding of it within the idiom of thought and experience now opening up to critical thinkers among us in our own situation. The two pursuits are not incompatible as I see them; that is attending to insights among people of other faiths and pursuing the cosmic and psychic depths of human existence within our own environmental and cultural stance. Each in its own way expresses release from fixations that have insulated the Christian West from the resources and relationships in which the "grace", about which the Christian speaks, could be empirically known and experienced within the natural context of our humanity. And with such encounter with the resources and realities of faith, Christianity itself might become a more viable source of energy and insight into the task of planetary renewal, which at the moment I would judge it is not.

Now in closing, I am moved to make an overall observation relating to the possible participation of religious groups in this concern with global environment. I am not sure that any analysis of developments in thought concerning the Christian legacy or tradition reflects the state of mind of the vast company of people who call themselves Christian. Theologically speaking, much of the church's life has become secularized. That is, it is responsive largely to insistent cultural directives and needs, rather than to any religious tradition that may underlie or lie back of their "gathered community". Thus the question as to whether churches can or cannot be counted upon to be responsive to the cultural crisis that is being pointed up in the theme of global environment turns less, it seems to me, upon changing winds of doctrine among theologians than changing orbits of priorities within the cultural experience. That theological inquiry is itself becoming attuned to the planetary vision of human experience, however, augurs well for reactivating that Christian legacy within the churches as a cultural resource of magnitude and efficacy. And in the converging of these two enterprises, namely theology so oriented and the religious community around an insistent cultural and human problem, there is promise that the future can be different with regard to correlating history and nature within Christian understanding and experience.

FMN/OEE WORKSHOP
30NOV-2DEC'72
STORRS, CT.

Where Are We Now in Relation to Political Participation in the Public Interest, in our Technological Society?

Donald G. Morgan

It is the thesis of this paper that science and technology have induced changes in the functioning of the political system in the United States, as no doubt elsewhere, and that those who would bring the resources of our religious traditions to bear on the problem of the environment should consider such changes. Happily, we have begun to become aware of the mounting threats posed by technological change to the physical environment. We have not, however, come to appreciate what has been happening to our social environment, or to the political system.

I shall not dwell here on social change. For generations we have been aware, more or less vaguely, that change was the order of life. By the 1960's however, many individual scholars, and institutes, notably the Harvard Program on Technology and Society, were at work on the problem. Primary groups, such as the family and the neighborhood, as well as the local community have lost much of their hold; in their place have developed vertical communities, nationwide in scope, each claiming to represent its members in a vital way. We seek meaning and fulfillment, not only in economic groups -- the business corporation, the labor union, the professional group -- but more recently in minority groupings -- women, blacks, ethnics, and the like. In a sense, however, these are abstractions often weak in person to person contact and lacking the intimate connection of leader and follower characteristic of primary and local groups.

My own special concern as a political scientist, is with change in the political system, or more particularly with the impact of the technological society on the constitutional order. I approach the problem, not as an observer or quantifier of the contemporary scene, but more as an historian of institutions. My assumption is first that Americans spent a century, from 1761 when the first protests against British rule were heard, until 1861, the year of the founding of M.I.T., discussing and implementing a political system which would maximize the equality and freedom of the individual, and the opportunity for individuals to control, that is to participate in, their government; and second, that since the 1860's, when technology became a field for distinct and separate professional education in a number of schools, the forces it let loose have induced radical alterations in the environment of the political system and severely strained the constitutional order and the values it safeguarded. The most beleaguered of those values is political participation, which gave citizens opportunities directly or through representatives to shape the making of policies in the public interest.

It was here at Storrs in 1956 that professor David Easton, of the University of Chicago, ventured what he called "An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems",[1] and described the relationships he saw between a political system and its environment, social, cultural, demographic, economic, ecological and personal. He later elaborated his theory in two books[2] and his Storrs paper has had a sustained impact on teaching and writing in the discipline.

My own interest has been in the impact of changes in the environment on changes in the system. I have singled out for analysis in the value of popular participation in policy-making and sought both perspective and precision of knowledge concerning change in the viability of that value. I have assumed that Congress was intended to serve as the main channel for participation at the national level and that through media citizens would become informed on deliberations and decisions by their national representatives. To bring a measure of specificity into an otherwise amorphous topic, I have employed case studies comparing the handling by Congress and the media of analogous forms of legislation (before 1861), the onset of the technological age and after its maturing (since 1950).

When one applies this method of comparative historical analysis to highway acts, to cite the first and most complete of my pairs of such studies, one gains insight

---

1. *World Politics*, 1957, vol.9; pp. 383-400.
2. *A Framework for the Analysis of Political Systems*, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965) and *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965).

into the broad problem. In 1802 and 1806, Congress enacted statutes providing for the Cumberland Road, a 139-mile stretch across the Appalachians from Cumberland, Maryland on the Potomac, through a part of Pennsylvania to Wheeling, West Virginia on the Ohio. By 1818 the road was completed; and later extensions as far as Illinois made this National Road an important route for westward migration. In 1956, Congress passed the Federal Aid Highway Act of that year, authorizing the laying out and construction of super-highways, the so-called Interstate System to the extent of some 41,000 miles. Everyone is now aware of the utility of this program and some of its unforseen and adverse consequences. What I am concerned with here are the changes which had taken place in the intervening century and a half in the environment, or ecology if you like, of the political system, and the corresponding changes in the deliberative function of Congress and the publicity function of media.

I should like to comment on three findings of this analysis:

First, what major changes in the environment of the political system does this highway study reveal? At least seven come to the fore:

A. Pressures for government action now originate less with individuals and local communities and more with organized interest groups. In 1802 and 1806 individuals engaged in quiet lobbying but spoke for localities and their own political parties. In 1956 there was never-ceasing activity by such national groups as the American Road Builders Association, the American Association of State Highway Officials, the Automobile Manufacturers Association, etc.

B. Action is no longer petitioned or requested but demanded with an urgency often assuming crisis proportions. Advocates of the Cumberland Road never used language such as the following so typical of the later episode: "There is an urgent need to improve our highways as quickly as possible...Action, comprehensive and quick and forward-looking, is needed...The people of this country...want to take drastic remedial action."[3]

C. Actions demanded are technical in character. In 1802 common sense and experience told most politicians all they needed to know about road-building. Later, they needed a phalanx of advisors, not merely to supply data, but to interpret it.

D. Demands for action have heightened in volume, with a resulting scarcity of time. In 1802 only five significant issues faced the Congress; in 1956 there were more than fifty, from Soviet tactics and the salvaging of Viet Nam to changes in Social Security and a National Health Program.

E. Actions call heavily for centralization. Throughout the 19th Century road-building remained a matter largely for local or county control with occasional aid from the

---

3. "Report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program", (the Clay Committee), reprinted in Highway Revenue Act of 1956, Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, on H.R. 9075, 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1956), p. 567.

state governments. The Interstate is wholly federal in conception and instigation. It is the culmination of sixty years of growing federal involvement.

F. Actions tend to be administrative in character, seeming to necessitate day-by-day expert attention. Congress, with Presidential cooperation, retained a continuing control over the Cumberland Road, granting a limited voice in routing and supervision to three commissioners and assigning construction to seasonal workers. By contrast, full time professionals made a career of the Interstate. The Bureau of Public Roads, collaborating with state highway officials and employing nine regional offices, planned, laid out, and implemented the system, once Congress had approved it.

A semi-independent highway bureaucracy went on planning even when construction had to lapse.

G. Actions require coordination. For the Cumberland Road there were few alternative routes and no alternative modes of transportation. In 1956 roads were but one of many forms of transportation, intricately related to one another. Moreover, it soon became clear that highways and the vehicles they spawned, could carry with them a whole range of consequences--city smog, trees leveled, neighborhoods paved over, railroads and mass transit systems in bankruptcy and traffic jams of colossal proportions. It was important in 1956 to anticipate all this, as the earlier debates had anticipated most of the effects of the Cumberland Road.

The natural tendency of these seven changes, in the environment of the political system unless consciously controlled, would be to concentrate power in the President, flanked by a vast bureaucracy, attentive to the demands of special interest groups, working often in secret and exploiting the media to sell his programs to a passive public.

It is my second finding that the deliberative function of Congress underwent a marked decline over this long period. In 1802, Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, proposed the Western Road directly to the majority leader of the House of Representatives, who in turn cleared it with a small select committee and then took it to the floor in Committee of the Whole. That body, so prominent in the early Congress, subjected it, within a matter of weeks to flexible and informal give-and-take, and then voted for the road in principle. After a brief committee stage, the resulting bill came back for final action in the House and followed a like course in the Senate.

All this had changed by 1954, when on July 4th President Eisenhower through Vice-President Nixon, presented a Grand Plan for superhighways not to Congress but to the Governor's Conference. Three groups then mulled over his proposal: a committee of the Governors (perennial seekers for highway funds), an interdepartmental study committee, and the five man Clay Committee, specially appointed by the President to study the problem. This last came up with a 101 billion dollar, ten year program which the President finally offered Congress in February, 1955.

Note three forms of structure not present in 1802: A. A vast federal and state highway bureaucracy as already noted, B. A strong array of special interest groups continually pressing for highway programs and exhorting their members to political action, and C. A series of permanent standing committees in Congress. These committees were permanent, contained members with experience in building or using roads who sought committee membership out of personal interest in highways, were one or two stages removed from the full chambers, had life and death power over highway proposals, drafted the pertinent bills, and worked in an atmosphere removed from exposure to other problems such as railroads or mass transit. Thus all three groups tended to share the philosophy of Charles Wilson, one of three members of the Eisenhower cabinet who made or sold cars, who asserted that what is good for General Motors is good for America. It was these three structures -- bureaucracy, interest groups, and congressional committees, that studied, discussed and framed the 1956 bill for presentation to the chambers, not, as formerly, early in the legislative process, but as a last stage, almost on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

But how had deliberation in the representative body deteriorated? To what extent did the people's representatives render decisions that were not predetermined, that were effectively final, and that were genuinely informed? Let us consider how the two houses acted on five issues associated with the highway proposals:

A. Is the proposed program needed? In 1802 the need for roads to the West was almost self-evident, although it was articulated several times in debate. The more agitating question was whether federal action was necessary, and on this, many spoke their minds. In the 1950's few ever went behind the President's assertion of four overriding reasons for superhighways: greater traffic safety, lower travel costs, alleviation of traffic problems, and evacuation of cities during an atomic attack. Time has put to question some of these; Sputnik soon made obsolete the national defense argument and the promise of a reduction in traffic congestion has proved somewhat illusory.

B. Are there alternative means of attaining the objective? In 1802 there was no alternative mode of transportation available, but there were other possible routes. Actually Congress itself talked out this question and on committee recommendation, fixed the termini of the route ultimately adopted. By the 1950's all this was left to the bureaucracy. More important, little or no thought was given on the floor or in committee to other modes of transportation such as railroads, airlines, or mass transit. Spokesmen for those interests seemed unaware of the probable consequences of the bill, and some of them merely sought to defend themselves from unfair taxation. Even had these groups done their home work, it is unlikely that the study groups and committees, oriented as they were towards roads, would have listened. Their premise was determination to move motor vehicles, not people and goods.

C. Is the proposal financially feasible? Both houses probed this issue in 1802 and 1806. In 1955-56 two financial controversies received attention. The first was bonding vs. pay-as-you-go; President Eisenhower's Clay Committee, which contained three bank officials, favored bonding, but Congress pressed the Administration to support a tax-based system. Congress, chiefly in committees, also resolved the second issue - highway-user taxes vs. general taxes in favor of the former, but in the process created the Highway Trust Fund. This Fund, which gave road-builders a permanent subsidy and for seventeen years defied every effort to tap it for mass transit or other non-highway purposes, received almost no public discussion.

D. Is the proposal technically feasible? During its four years of sporadic talk about the Cumberland Road Congress worked out the specifications of the project: the two-page statute set the width of roadway, the design of road and ditches, the maximum grade -- 5 degrees with the horizon, etc. Clearly, local men, animals and materials could do the job and members spoke from common experience in debates on the construction plans. All this had changed by 1955, when Congress took up the Interstate System. The legislators listened meekly to experts from the bureaucracy and interest groups concerning supplies, design and construction and in the end left road planning to the bureaucracy. A major concern was whether the industry could double its capacity in time to complete this mammoth program. Committee members seemed to take at face value reports from the road-builders promising success in this venture. Only twice, when members briefly commented on a cement shortage, were such issues raised on the floor. The word of the experts was taken as gospel.

E. Will the program have adverse long-range consequences? Congress accurately foresaw the utility of the Cumberland Road. What concerned many was the effect it would have on regions and towns, those through which it passed and those it by-passed. Competition was rife, and the rivalry of Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania in seeking to obtain the route caused a three-year delay in enactment.

The discussion of the 1956 bill failed to anticipate later events. Specialization in administrative investigation and in committee structure helped keep in obscurity the effects of the highway program on railroads and mass transit. Effects on the physical environment were virtually ignored. Only once in two years of hearings did a conservationist testify, and then ineffectually. The effects on cities were viewed from the vantage point of road-builders, i.e. - how to gain rights-of-way, not from that of residents of neighborhoods or users of parts soon to be bulldozed. Congress and the Administration tended to ignore such matters or leave them to bureaucrats, who as specialists had neither responsibility nor feeling for such issues.

In short, of the five issues discussed, only financial feasibility was given anything like full discussion in 1955-1956, and that largely outside the chambers. If deliberation had dried up, this was only partly attributable to the volume and complexity of issues; it resulted also from the century-long relinquishment to others of the power and discretion of the two houses.

The third finding of the highway study has to do with media coverage. I assume that for full popular participation, not only should legislators deliberate, but the substance of their deliberations should be conveyed to citizens by the media. Without full, accurate coverage, including facts and opposed positions on issues, citizens are unable to achieve any sort of informed judgment on policy questions.

I have studied coverage of the two road acts as contained in newspapers and periodicals. For the early period I chose four newspapers, two national in circulation, one regional (New England), and one local, the Scioto Gazette of Chillicothe, Ohio, the state capital where support for the road should have been at the highest. For the later period, I chose three newspapers, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and a Hearst journal, the Boston Record-American. To these were added three special interest organs: the weekly Engineering News Record, the monthly Roads and Streets, and the quarterly American Highways, organ of the state highway officials. Analysis was made not only of general coverage throughout each period, but of specific coverage of selected events in each period.

One can say, on the basis of preliminary research that the press of the early period struggled against heavy odds to report what happened in Congress faithfully to its readers. Technical difficulties were great and space was limited -- at the most to eight pages. Yet with some exceptions, these papers presented two sorts of stories on Congress, apart from the often highly partisan editorials: first a regular column summarizing actions in the "National Legislature", second, a fuller, though often delayed elaboration including summations of texts of bills, debates, committee reports, letters and resolutions. Even the Chillicothe Gazette, Republican in complexion, printed verbatim a strongly Federalist speech against the Jeffersonian program.

Modern coverage provided some remarkable contrasts. News and the technology of publishing proliferated, creating new problems: how to cover everthing and how to continue old stories when new events clamored for space. So the three dailies had trouble covering the 1956 Act. Some gave a box score of the bill's position in Congress, some tried to condense events to the smallest possible compass, some had to drop stories when they lost their timeliness. None of the dailies reproduced the content of debates, most stressed action, atmosphere, political maneuvers, and other surrounding circumstances. The Hearst organ gave only meagre news, often buried, and strongly editorialized for highways. William Randolph Hearst himself, after conferring with auto builders in Detroit, had decided to push a highway program as early as 1952.

For a lengthy and informed treatment one had to turn to the special interest periodicals. Here at least were full, often technical analyses of proposals. Readers were kept up to date on developments by a frontispiece on news from Washington. Yet the whole tone of these organs was not "Do we need roads?", but "How can we get them?" and "How can we overcome obstacles and hostile arguments?" To summarize a complex situation, in some sense early coverage gave readers a clearer picture of issues than later. Modern treatment tended to confirm the general reader in his ignorance, and the special interest reader in his biases.

Several tentative conclusions concerning the problem are warranted:

1. Modern technology has produced radical changes in society and complicated the task of those who would seek to further the public interest through participation.

2. Yet the structures which grew up under pressures of those changes grew without due attention to their effects on genuine deliberation on public issues. It was

inevitable that the President would gain so greatly at the expense of Congress or that floor debate would suffer such a decline. It was never predetermined that decision-making should drift to standing committees in consultation with like minded members of interest groups and the bureaucracy.

3. The same can be said of media coverage. The United States has the technical facilities and the know-how to supply full and balanced coverage to its citizens once there is a determination to achieve that prerequisite of full participation.

4. Behind these changes lies a change in culture, a tendency to accept at face value all demands for technological innovation. One of the tasks of a new religious orientation would be a continuing assertion of values that are threatened by such innovations.

Reconstructions of Scientific and Religious Consciousness for a Better Environmental Future

George A. Riggan

The reference to our environmental future, in the theme of the workshop in which the substance of this paper was first presented, implies a need for improving our environment. I believe we are agreed both that the need exists, and that it does not arise from natural disasters. The need for a better environmental future is rather the consequence of the priorities that have guided our own technological applications of exponentially increasing scientific knowledge about man and his world. I am persuaded that we are not about to abandon science and technology. If that is the case, then the achievement of a better environmental future depends upon an expansion of human consciousness. That better future calls for a common, everyday perception of the systemic linkages between human life and the finite resources of spaceship Earth, and for the consequent common recognition of the trade-offs that inevitably limit our choices of human lifestyles.

For example, peoples of the entire world are demanding the health benefits now available only in the developed nations. They should have them. Delivery of those services will radically reduce infant mortality and increase longevity. But, unless contraceptive technology is used at the same time, both in developed and in developing countries, to reduce human natality no less radically, we are then on the way to a catastrophic irruption of the human population.

The possibility of that catastrophe evokes the vivid impression made two or three years ago by John Calhoun, the ethologist, in a comment concerning the crises precipitated by the explosion of the human population. He declared that the fundamental crisis is not that of the irruption itself of the human population, nor yet the impingement of that irruption upon scarce resources. He held that the global ecosystem probably can support a human population of fifteen or sixteen billion, in some arrangement or another, and still afford some options for choice among lifestyles. The fundamental crisis, as he saw it, arises from the way we deal with the population explosion. What limits upon lifestyles will we set for succeeding generations by the decisions we make, either in positive action or by default? Will our choices be informed and their consequences humane, or will they be insistently uninformed and cruelly inhumane?

In increasing numbers and ever more insistently, the human population is demanding the health and educational services and the material goods made possible by the magic of science and technology. Yet all too often the cost of technologic wizardry is ignored. We face two ways, or combinations of them, for raising human consciousness of the interlocking advantages and disadvantages consequent upon technologic interventions in the processes of human life and of our environment. One way is to muddle through our decisions until their catastrophic consequences force themselves upon our attention. The energy crisis is the latest case in point. The hazard on that route is that our population is now so large and technologic interventions so massive and numerous that we risk the survival of our species in waiting out the unanticipated consequences of our decisions.

Another route toward raising human consciousness of the potentialities for both good and evil in our technologies is to examine concepts and purposes by which traditionally our decisions have been guided, and to transform or abandon those guidelines, as may be required by our inadequate but ever expanding knowledge of the interlocking connections between natural and cultural systems. I must confess mixed hope and pessimism when I question whether deliberation of our guiding concepts will be sufficiently spurred by minor catastrophes to enable our anticipation and avoidance of major cataclysms. But so long as there is time, I propose to work for deliberate examination and transformation of the guiding concepts around which our values cluster.

Human value systems and human behavior are responsive, of course, to preconscious psychological processes - processes that root perhaps in the genetic endowment of our species. But the culturally developed conceptual frameworks - within which human decisions are made, interpreted, and justified - significantly shape the expression of those conative processes. I am prepared to identify these guiding (or cybernetic) concepts as products of mythic consciousness, if by the mythos of a people we mean a pattern of beliefs expressing (often in the symbolisms of art, drama and religion) the meanings and values characteristic or prevalent in a group or culture. When we examine these mythic or cybernetic concepts in cultures other than our own, we find that they combine cognitive information significant for human survival in a particular environment with the affective sensibilities, ideals, and values of the cultures in which the mythic constructs arise.

For purposes of this discussion, then, a myth is a story, an event, or a concept in terms of which people understand the meaning for themselves of their actual living in a specific place and time. A myth is a conceptual framework, an existential gestalt, for guiding self-commitment and self-actualization toward survival and the realization of values cherished by the self or by the culture in a particular environment. The effective myth is open to cognitive information bearing on the achievement of the goals just mentioned, but the myth always enables a decision, a commitment that must be made before all relevant information is in and before all consequences can possibly be anticipated. Myth is the heuristic structure of faith.

One root of our present environmental crisis is the tendency in scientifically oriented, technologic cultures to dissever scientific consciousness from mythic consciousness. Scientifically verifiable cognition legitimately, indeed inevitably, requires that we distance ourselves existentially from what we are trying to understand. Only by such distancing can we keep our emotions and our vested interests from distorting the design of research and the conclusions drawn from it. Too often, however, our scientists have sought, not distance, but severance of scientific from mythic consciousness.

If in the beginning this severance was necessitated by the stance of ecclesiastical authorities against conclusions drawn from early scientific investigations, its perpetuation has since had the hearty approval of many a scientist.

The attempted severance of scientific from mythic consciousness has left the guidance of Western culture in chaotic confusion. Whether intentionally or not, scientists have wrought changes in the mythic structures by which our values are legitimated. Hence we witness the collapse of some of our traditional mythic concepts, once honored, but now no longer sufficiently credible or relevant under new conditions consequent upon a succession of scientific and technological revolutions. The historic tendency among scientists to refuse responsibility for questions of value, combined with the denigration of the mythic in our culture, has left the legitimation of values too often in the hands of our demagogues. As a consequence, we seize uncritically upon traditional mythic constructs - the urban myth, for example - to justify rape of our environment. Or we elevate popular misconceptions of scientific principles to mythic function. Natural selection, for example, applies specifically to the differential reproduction of biological systems. Only those genes that reproduce themselves survive. In demagogic mythos, however, the concept of natural selection is extended to justify systems of racial and sexual discrimination, and to legitimate dehumanizing economic, penological, and welfare systems. The environmental crisis is salutary insofar as it has awakened us to the need for a critical, multidisciplinary evaluation and reconstruction of the fragmented and conflicting myths by which we attempt to guide the course of Western technological culture.

The reconstruction of the mythic legitimations of our values is by no means exclusively a matter for experts. Cultural traditions arise from human experience and embody a great deal of wisdom for successful living. But the human scientific enterprise is designed to be potentially more responsive to the negative consequences of our experiments in living than are tradition and common sense. In an age of rapid technologic change, therefore, we need careful monitoring of the feedback from technologic interventions such as only the sciences can provide.

One of the most powerful of traditional mythic paradigms in Western culture is the urban myth - the myth of the city. I remind you that, since the time of David, Jerusalem stands out as a mythic symbol in the biblical tradition. David's conquest of that city and his exploitation of its political institutions hastened full adoption by the Hebrews of messianic kingship and stabilized the transition of Hebrew life from a nomadic existence to the settled agricultural economy of a royal city state, protected by the fortifications of Jerusalem. Under David's leadership, the ideology of messianic kingship penetrated Hebrew religious life. Thus ancient Jerusalem provided the model for biblical conceptions both of the kingdom of God and the city of God. Despite a growing cynicism toward earthly cities and mortal kings, New Jerusalem and the kingdom of God linger as utopian symbols of our cherished values.

Rome was another contributor to our urban mythos. Many of our basic values are enshrined in concepts derived from life in ancient Rome. Our words city and citizen come through the French from the Latin civis - a citizen. From the same root we get civil and civilization as other terms embodying our ideals. Who would dare aim to be other than civilized? Our words urban and urbane derive from the Latin, urbs - an ancient term for the city state. Though we may question some of the values of urbanization, who wants to be less than urbane? If you want to be civilized, if you want to be urbane; if you don't want to be a pagano - a man from the country, and if you know what it's all about, off you go to the city. Or you do your best to urbanize the country. Metropolis, megalopolis, politics, policy, police and other terms built upon the root polis, Greek for city, further evidence the clustering of our values around concepts related to urbanization. Thank God we're beginning to question the urban mythos, even though it still dominates the social, economic and political life of what was once proudly called Christian civilization.

More potent than the urban myth, and more deluding, is the myth of the substantive self. According to this conception, the human self is a totally independent entity - possessing a body, brain, a physical and social environment, yet capable of existing in full independence of them all. Many strands of Western culture portray the human subject, the ego, I,

BEST COPY AVAILA3LE

myself, as having external relations only to all else in experience. Though alien to the thought of the ancient Hebrews, Gnostic influences have left traces of this myth both in New Testament and neo-Platonic writings. This myth motif is evident in the philosophy of Descartes. Kant pressed the logic of the subject-object dichotomy to its extreme conclusion in his effort to limit the encroachment of the sciences upon ethical and religious conceptions. He assigned the experiencing self and the logic of its moral behavior to the realm of the noumenal, beyond the reach of empirical or scientific examination. The experienced self and its world he assigned to the phenomenal realm, subject to the logic of the empirical and hence open to scientific investigation. The Kantian critique, however, cuts two ways. By severing ethical and religious consciousness from sensory experience, he also cut the sciences loose from subjective and moral considerations. The ironic consequences strike us forcibly if we compare the outlook of Western economic theory with the outlook emergent in the more recent development of ecologic sciences.

Economic and ecologic conceptions alike root historically in the Greek concept of household (oikos). Originally the concept oikos signified not only the dwelling, but all its inhabitants - master, mistress, children, slaves, hired hands - as well as all livestock, the land, and all industry and commerce based upon it. The term thus named a complex integration of biological systems and cultural systems within a particular habitat. Parenthetically, the author of the

Letter to the Ephesians used this concept as a rich metaphor for religious self-understanding, assuring non-Jewish converts to Christianity that their conversion made them fellow citizens with the saints, members of the household of God (Ephesians 2.19).

Western economic theory developed, however, in a Cartesian and Kantian climate. In that climate, claims for the autonomy of economic principles were too readily accepted, the claims for moral principles too easily rejected as extraneous to the field of economics. There were exceptions to that attitude, of course, but the exceptions were perhaps disproportionately frequent among the economically powerless victims of the system. But the mythos of the subjective-objective split lingers on in our technologic culture. The administration of the human household (oikonomia) has long ceased to be a matter of sustaining the potentialities and fulfilling the needs of all the interlocking systems comprising the eco-complex - including the habitat no less than the generations of people in it. Instead reference to the economy signifies the production, distribution, and use of material goods, both for consumption and for increased production. Though we recognize a service component in the economy, we are reluctant to regard the services of a parent to a child as within the economic structure - to cite but one example. From the strictly economic perspective, inhabitants of the eco-complex are perceived in terms of their functions as laborers, managers, capitalists, consumers, entrepreneurs, and the like. Their specifically economic relationships are too often presumed to be governed by laws that operate independently of their behavior as persons. The grim irony of economic research is that, freed from involvement in human subjectivity to be thoroughly scientific, it so frequently becomes in practice a dehumanizing and ecologically destructive art.

Another view, however, of the nature of man and of man's relation to the physical and biological world runs through the Western philosophical and theological tradition, as Alfred North Whitehead has demonstrated in his _Process and Reality_. From this perspective man stands out no longer as a substantive entity _possessing_ a mind, a brain, a body and an environment. Instead, man comes into view as a constituent process within a universal system of perishing and creative becoming. Viewed processually, the self cannot be understood if it is dissevered from its environment, for self-and-environment are polar aspects of systemically interlocking processes. As Whitehead himself sometimes insisted, the living self does not exist apart from the air it breathes.

I have suggested elsewhere that Whitehead derived the basic model of his processual metaphysics from theoretical developments in microphysics. There I have also argued that more recent developments in the ecological sciences - especially in genetics, biophysics, and evolutionary theory - tend both to reinforce Whitehead's basic speculation and to require modification of some of its details.* In any case, the combined sciences of ecology have recovered something of the original Greek conception of oikos, and in doing so have enormously expanded the concept. Those sciences portray man, not as dominating his earthly household, but rather as depending upon the global ecosystem of which he is a part both for the origin and the continued existence of his species, and for the quality of his life.

---

*G.A. Riggan, "An Epilogue to the Symposium on Human Purpose, Goals and Values," _Zygon_ 8 (September-December, 1973), pp. 443-481.

Bronowski has developed a model of stratified stability to account for the evolutionary process in such a way as to make it appear that the physical universe itself is an ecological system. He has exemplified, for instance, the stages in which the elements listed in the atomic table have evolved. His most spectacular illustration concerns the evolution of carbon from hydrogen. When two nuclei of hydrogen collide under proper conditions, they combine to form an atom of stable helium. When two nuclei of helium collide, they stay together for less than a millionth of a second. But if, in that tiny instant, they are hit by the nucleus of a third helium atom, the three combine to form a stable atom of carbon. Carbon, of course, is an indispensable component of every cell in every living organism on the planet Earth. It is awesome to consider that all the carbon in every plant and animal on earth was produced by such seemingly highly improbable triple collisions of helium nuclei. The production of all of the carbon on earth by such collisions boggles the imagination until we are reminded of the billions of years through which our planet has slowly evolved, and of the once enormous population of helium atoms in the earth's atmosphere. Bronowski's model of the evolutionary process reflects the fact that the more complex of the physical elements are not produced from simple hydrogen. Their production entails a series of steps or strata of intermediate stabilities in which the appearance of each higher stratum depends upon the prior production of the stable form in the stratum just below it. Bronowski's model holds not only for the physical elements, but also for the evolution of the megamolecules, of which DNA and RNA are the most astonishingly complex examples.* Genetic instructions for the building of all living organisms are encoded, of course, in DNA. Natural selection operating upon random variations in the reproduction of genetic material is responsible for still another series of stratified stabilities, exhibited in the evolution of the various species of plant and animal life.

The evidence underlying Bronowski's model calls, it seems to me, for the rejection of Whitehead's view that all phenomena, even at the level of the microphysical, exhibit mental as well as physical characteristics. Despite technical limitation of his terms, Whitehead is using metaphors derived from specicically human experience when he attributes to microphysical states such mental characteristics as prehension, feeling, subjective aim, satisfaction and the like. Such metaphors tend not to increase understanding so much as to conceal our ignorance. I would suggest that mental behavior can not be attributed to hydrogen _cua_ hydrogen, nor to helium, or carbon, or DNA as such. The possibility of consciousness is a function of a _series_ of transformations of energy - a series in which successively higher and more complex stabilized forms are achieved, each on the basis of the antecedent appearance of the stratum next lower. Hydrogen, helium, and carbon exist as stable phenomena in the successive strata of that series. Though the possibility of consciousness is latent in the total set of transformations, actual consciousness is a function of the whole series only at the level on which organisms with brains make their actual appearance. Specifically human consciousness obviously awaits the appearance of man.

---

*J. Bronowski, "New Concepts in the Evolution of Complexity: Stratified Stability and Unbounded Plans," _Zygon_ 5 (1970): 18-35.

Parenthetically, from an ecological perspective the living human brain seems to be the indispensable condition of human consciousness. The content of that consciousness depends, of course, upon cognitive and affective information received through the sense organs and the whole central nervous system. But in ecological perspective brain states and states of consciousness are perceived as aspects of one and the same process. It may be that I will survive brain death and will know my wife, my parents, children, and neighbors, and will remember the events of my lifetime in some post mortem existence. However, the ecological model of human experience provides as yet no foundation for that belief. Mythic understandings of the self inevitably connote more than can be fully denoted in scientific information. Nevertheless, I regard it as self-deceitful to justify the execution as criminals of persons possibly innocent, or to justify war or the rape of the earth's resources by any generation - as many conservative religionists are wont to do - merely on the presumption of life after death.

While Bronowski's model of stratified stability prohibits the anthropomorphising of lower strata in the evolutionary process, it does enable us to perceive the evolution of the physical universe and the evolution of life and of human culture on the planet Earth as comprising a single evolving ecosystem. When we view man within this frame of reference, we can say with Julian Huxley and Teilhard de Chardin, that man is the subsystem in which the evolving cosmos becomes conscious of itself. Further, in man - for the first time so far as we know - the cosmic ecosystem achieves a conscious and purposive control over some of its evolving processes. For man is not only conscious of being conscious; he is singularly endowed to acquire, to store, to transmit, and to employ symbolic knowledge for purposes either good or evil. Awesome indeed are the consequences of his capacity for consciously purposive intervention in the processes of the system within which he had his origins and upon which he depends for the quality and the very survival of human life. Whether his life shall be crowned with glory or plunged into misery depends in large part upon his use of that endowment.

If the prospect for a better environmental future opened to us by the ecologic sciences calls for a reconstruction of our understanding of man, that prospect calls no less for a reconstruction of our prevailing conceptions of God. As we have seen, some elements for an ecologically sound vision of God are to be found already embedded in our theological tradition. But if monotheism is to figure significantly in the mythos of an improved ecological future, we must abandon the view that the cosmic ecosystem was created and is sustained and governed by an absentee landlord God - just as we must also abandon the view that a sovereign deity out there beyond the system has transferred to us tenants dominion over the earth and all creatures in it. Our metaphors for the reality that concerns us ultimately are better drawn from the outmoded politics of sovereign kingship. Further, with Whitehead we must insist that the concept of God be the highest exemplification of the logic by which we explain human experience, and not an exception to the categories of that logic dragged in to save our model of explanation from collapse.

From an ecological perspective, and in reference to our concern for a better environmental future, what then do we mean by the word God, and why is it important that we use theological language at all?

For many people the term God has no mythic function; it symbolizes no abiding frame of reference for self-understanding and self-commitment in the midst of a world swamped with information, yet short on perspective and values. Yet for me the word performs two important mythic functions. First, in my use of the term, God attests my belief that the seeming chaos of human experience - my experience - is framed by an orderly universe. In Whiteheadian language, God is for me the principle of concretion. Or, to express the same idea in other language, the term God names the presumed fact that all changing things will forever exhibit the invariances of a system of component subsystems. Yet every competent scientist expresses by his continued research the conviction that undiscovered interrelationships await discovery on the growing edge of his discipline. The entire scientific enterprise takes shape as a vast information process based upon confidence in reliable - that is to say systemically interrelated - feedback from the phenomena under examination. Strong evidence supports this faith - evidence of a few thousand or a few million years. But no one can demonstrate that the evidence for systemic interrelatedness will hold forever.

Note however that the term God is not used in this first or primordial meaning to signify just any systemic order whatsoever. God is the cohesive invariance, the continuity of an actual world in which many things cease to be what they are and constantly become what now they are not. The word God names all present and all possible systemic interconnections within the world of which we are a part.

An abstraction! Yes, indeed. But what is abstracted in the concept of the primordial nature of God manifests itself concretely in the actual cosmos. Hence the concept, God, has a consequent as well as primordial aspect. In the evolution of physical and biological systems, for example, God is manifest as random variation and consequent selection of forms stable in a changing environment. To ignore God at that level of our existence is to risk the extinction of our species. Among persons, the divine cohesion is manifest as concern for the well being of the self and neighbor; in that meaning, God is love. To neglect God at the personal and social level of our existence is to lose our humanity.

Though the invariances of God's primordial nature are eternally potential in the cosmic ecosystem, they are actually manifest only in the successive phases of its evolution. Hence the consequent nature of God is temporal - subject to the creative tension between continuity and change. Whether or not God is self-conscious other than in the awareness of human beings - or other creatures like us - we do not know. The sadness of that unanswered question haunts us. But surely in us God is joyful when we celebrate the wonders of cosmic creation. In us God is grieved when we experience the loss of all things that perish in order that the new may come. God lives, if no where else, at least in us and in all of Earth's living creatures. In God, we in turn live and move and have our being. Whether or not we shall be conscious beyond our dying, death cannot be our final end, for the eternal God has both given life and informed our living -- "God our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, and our eternal home."

The reason for the use of ecologic metaphors in mythic frames of reference seems to me clearly evident. The mythos of any culture is no more trustworthy for the survival and fulfillment of human life than the cognitive information embodied in it. Cognitive information and misinformation have always been enshrined in myth. The Old Testament, for example, exhibits a male chauvinist understanding both of human beings and of God, for it was written under the influence of the surprising discovery that the male sperm has something to do with the production of babies. Until well into the Christian era, the function of the ovum was forgotten or unknown in the West. Hence it was believed that women contributed nothing genetically to reproduction except a suitable seed bed. In Hebraic understanding the world was to be blessed in the seed of Abraham; Sarah was of instrumental value only. In numerous ways the biblical mythos cries out for ecologic reformation.

But then why use religious language at all? I suggest in reply that man cannot live by scientific information alone. The human organism carries encoded in DNA, below the level of consciousness, information for the construction of other living human beings. The science of genetics can not yet duplicate that information, probably never will. Then too in the actual art of living we acquire by acquaintance an intimate and concrete knowledge that can neither be captured or verified by the distant abstractions of the sciences.

Though decidedly important, scientific knowledge is but a fragment of the valid knowledge possible concerning the self, the neighbor, and the world in which we live. Of course I can distance myself from my wife, for example. I can retreat from holistic, personal involvement - treat her as a psychological, or sociological, or biological specimen. But if I attempted to live with her at the objectifying distance, she ought to divorce me, and probably would. So too I can retreat from a holistic, that is to say a religious, involvement with myself, my neighbors, and our world. In doing so I should avoid the prejudice and the clutter of misinformation perpetuated in every religious tradition. But then, too, I should lose the great wisdom for the art of living gathered and transmitted in the great religions.

The call for a better environmental future calls, then, for a transformed mythos. That better future requires a scientific and a religious consciousness alike responsive to the message sounding daily from the conflict among nations and classes of people and from the tortured interchanges between man and his present environment.

Reporting Session: Task Groups for Reconstructive Follow-through

Frederick P. Ferré - Session Moderator

C. Alan Anderson - Editor of the reports and comments

Fred Ferré - We had an interesting configuration of groups. I don't know whether everybody realizes what happened; the theology and philosophy people first invited and then invaded the life style group for the first 75-minute period. Then we withdrew and talked by ourselves in the second 75-minute period, and then - as I understand - as we left, as nature abhors a vacuum, the other group that had been meeting by themselves in the first 75-minute period moved into the life style group, which means that the life style group in a sense becomes what Aristotle would call the middle term. It's interesting that we only had two groups operating at once at any given time. So there's already some cross-pollination that's occurred. Now what we need to do, I suppose, is to get some clarity out on the floor as to what went on in these various groups; but so this won't be a session just devoted to reports, we can have some brief statements, perhaps beginning with Alan Anderson, who was the recorder for the first joint session - life style with philosophy and theology. Perhaps, Alan, you can make your report briefly as to what you consider salient moments in that first session, and then since you have the floor, just continue to see how this concluded with our second session. If people would like to interupt Alan, I think that would be in order. On the other hand, Alan has promised to be brief and therefore if you wish to hear the whole sweep of it, that would also be perfectly appropriate.

Alan Anderson - The life style group, when the philosophy and theology group arrived after meeting briefly to decide to join the life style group, was considering what is meant by a life style or a style of life. As it was pointed out some years ago, various definitions of what a life style is had been given before I came. We have notes with regard to developing models, what people do and don't do, questions of how coherent it is, of what manner of expression is involved, then to what extent this expression is involved, then to what extent this expression involves personal conduct, mind, body, spirit and what one does and does not do. The question of the origin of the term life style arose, and we got into a discussion involving among other matters, Adler and Time Magazine.

The question of the discipline of life in relation to the aesthetic mode arose, as did the question of sensitivity versus responsibility. To what extent do we need to be responsible? To what extent does life style flow out of your value system and to what extent is it possible to create a life style deliberately? Are new values possible or is it a case simply of there being new priorities involved in old values? We cannot avoid life styles, however coherent or incoherent they may be. It was pointed out that young people, especially today emphasize aesthetic coherence, something which is of great significance. The question of cultural imperialism or elitism arose with regard to the sharing of our insights with other people. Should we attempt to define the end product, the type of person who will be living well with the universe?

As the time of the first session drew to a close, there were proposals with regard to especially desirable values, these being listed as first harmony with nature, second simplicity of life patterns, especially with regard to the amount and style of consumption of goods, third the question of communality in relation to interpersonal relations and fourth, social justice.

Then at the end of the first period, the philosophy and theology group withdrew or transcended to another room. The suggestion at the very beginning of the new session on philosophy and theology was that there was a great deal of interest in the practical angle of problems, but very little on religion as it is customarily considered; it was suggested that this may very well be one of the more significant results or by-products of the conference: that we may have more of religionless religion or secularly oriented religion than we normally assume and perhaps without benefit of explicitly deciding in favor of that. Reference was made to the additional amount of education in science that people have today and the difficulty that this brings about in terms of solidly held convictions in religion such as might have been the case when people knew much less of other competing religions.

The question as to the compatibility of different religious systems arose and the possibility of something roughly comparable to a federal system in which there might be all religions continuing independently, but each of them rising to some new insights with regard to the underlying bases which they hold in common; or perhaps some new outlook would give them particularly greater significance now in view of some special outlook. It was especially the Whiteheadian process thought which received the greatest attention, at least at the beginning of our discussion. This was put forth by practically everyone, I think as a viable basis for interpretation of the religious development in the world today. It was suggested that there ought to be more demythologizing of religion. The question of whether there are religious traditions consonant with ecological information that ought to be conserved, arose. The point was made that we are in effect opting against a commonly head Newtonian view of subject and object in much that we would be proposing here. Whether to begin with ethics or metaphysics was considered.

If birth entitles us to certain rights such as good education, certainly we have to be more concerned with the extent of birth in the world. Integrity was viewed as the wholeness of man and the world, contrasted to the view of man apart from everything else. The moral nobility of suicide and euthanasia were discussed, particularly in certain cases of illnesses which appear to have no recovery possible. One of the more important observations made was that mortal life is an intrinsic good, but not an absolute good, and that we have to come to see the state of death in life as well as continuation of life.

There was a good deal of agreement on the view that there are no solutions to the problems of using the world's resources which are not morally objectionable in some respects. In other words, it's necessarily a matter of choosing lesser evils in much, if not all that we do. Whatever is actual is finite, and therefore because of this in the Whiteheadian system there is necessarily tragedy in the world and while we achieve order, we also find frustration of order and it is part of a mature religious outlook to recognize this so that we do not always seek the happy ending or think that this is essential; at the same time it was pointed out that in great religious traditions this has always been something which has been transcended perhaps by the view that what happens is somehow all for the best in the very broadest view. It also was observed that our emphasis ought to be more one of bringing ourselves into accordance with whatever divine reality we conceive of, rather than simply trying to bend things to our own immediately obvious good interest. By seeing ourselves within a broader, essentially divine context, we can identify ourselves with it rather than trying to modify it for our preferences. The voluntary practice of self-restraint is necessary, and it was pointed out that if we do not restrain ourselves we will encounter hostile pressure from without.

Obviously we did not have the opportunity to discuss all these things in great detail, and at the end of our meeting there was some expression of regret that we did not have time to get into the matter of individual workshipful activities and the degree to which they relate to the whole overall attitude in making ecological sense.

Religious Institutions and Life Style

Jessma Blockwick - We were discussing the third aspect of our lives, theoretical action, the institutional, and the point I think we got with most clarity and depth was how fragmented our lives are. That we do not have concepts and models of wholeness to tie these different aspects together, and we really came down most completely on the need for support communities from people as being one of the apparently most crying needs of people in our own society - need for support communities and the accent element - that there needs to be a constant process of feed-back and we need a great deal more work on the feedback loop between these support communities, if we are to learn how to build them and the action that might arise out of them. But as somebody phrased it, we need to "be the wholeness" as a basis of doing the wholeness, that we couldn't see it as a simple chronological development. First we have to create these communities, and then action will result. They have to be intermeshed in time and every other element, but each is necessary and there has to be a constant go-between, so we weren't quite sure how that was to be done. Our group was looking at the institution - the religious institution - so that was the kind of community we were thinking about, and were pretty much in agreement, I would say, that the institutional church is not meeting that need right now. An example was sketched of an attempt to create support communities that are intimate and that have symbols to meet the needs of the people who are now largely on the fringe of the institutional church. The larger wholeness is sometimes an obstacle to this smaller wholeness. The bigness of our institutions - the church and others too - is a difficult problem; bigness is a fact and it's not going to go away. But neither can we just assume that everybody is going to live in little communes that will satisfy their souls. We have to grapple with the fact that bureaucracy is not going to go away; whatever new mechanisms we might devise have got to take these realities into consideration. So we would have ended in trying to think of new ways that we can accept the fact that bureaucracy moves inflexibly up and down in every direction, in order to have the action that is needed. But I'm not sure we really found what was to meet the need of these support communities, besides some attempts that are going on.

Ferré - Were you assuming that the support communities would have a kind of consensus about what the truth is with regard to such matters of fact, on the one hand, as ecological pressures and, on the other hand, to certain ultimate images of the nature of things? That is, are these to be organized within a context of common belief about what is the case?

Blockwick - I think not, I think we were really, and the others can join in, thinking in terms of a community which would give unquestioning support to people, from which they could take risks of action, and there was no implied assumption that we would all agree on the action. Our discussion centered on the fact that people need some basis that is unquestioning and that then there could be leaps of faith or risked action, such as questioning the practices of corporations, instead of there not being any groups that one could be sure would give even personal support...

Ferré - They see the congregation as being this group, or some people within the congregation?

Blockwick - Well, that's where it is right now. The usual circles on the edges of the institutional church are pretty small, by and large.

A question - Could you distinguish between the congregation as we know it and what you might call the congregational dynamics which phenomenologically you might see in terms of the caring communal, the symbolic-liturgical, the intellectual, reflective side and the action types that emerge in phenomenological analysis of congregations in some campus situations? People couldn't find that in traditional congregations, but one part of that campus group, taking that illustration, said they would like to zero in to see if they could make the traditional congregation as we know it become something of that support group. So alternative institutions might be formed by trying to renew and recreate on a local level and attempting to give them global or holistic quality rather than the parochial kind of thing that's not relevant to the actional involvements of people.

(In response to a question unclear in the recording, Jessma included the following observation) - We're thinking about something that would support humans as humans and not on the basis of what actions they are taking or what programs they were pursuing; what we are missing is what the extended family might do, where you had a place and a role and acceptance in spite of everything else.

Ferré - I think it's a very interesting thing that in these two reports we've got two different, entirely different approaches to reconstruction, because of course that's the topic of the whole thing. One kind of reconstruction that I think Alan was trying to describe was going the route of trying to reexamine some of the fundamental both scientific and the theological belief structures to see what it is that can be affirmed in a time of confusion and of attempt to rebuild and so on.

Perhaps certain implications ethically could be derived having to do with abortion, with euthanasia, with resource use and the rest. You other people, I think have had the very important alternative way of reconstruction in which you don't start cognitively or in terms of working out some kind of common belief about the empirical situation, or the theological, but rather at the level of accepting human beings, first of all, so that within the context of personal acceptance, reconstruction of life practices and thought could go ahead. Am I interpreting what is foundational to your sense of community support here? Is that right, that the reconstruction would then occur?

Blockwick - I don't know that we did it in terms of "this is the way."

Ferré - I may be misperceiving, but it seems to me that I see two routes to the need that we all feel, to venture out and to find some fresh ground to move from.

Comment - I think you may be forcing a synthesis here.

Ferré - I'm not trying to synthesize. There are two approaches: one is the personal acceptance of people. Let's get on to the second one. The other one was the one that Alan was reporting on, that is, the attempt to try to see what we can believe in these days.

Anderson - At the risk of oversimplification, I suppose that the approach just given (by Jessma Blockwick) is the affective approach whereas the one that I gave was the cognitive. There is a circle here, in that the cognitive in a certain sense begins its examination on the basis of the affective and to the extent that it takes into account such things as mystical experience it begins at the point of wholeness, of acceptance, of participating in reality in its fullness - not cut up in intellectual terms. It begins there and goes on to examine it and proposes to go on from analysis to a constructive rebuilding. So these approaches certainly are complementary and it is very interesting and rather exciting and healthy to see the way that people can begin at any stage of the process and work from that to the other - which I think is a way of verifying, in a limited way at least, the validity of the whole undertaking.

Public Policy in the Public Interest and Religious Institutions

Chauncey Olinger - We came in on the life style group and what I began to hear was that we were picking up off the work that had been done there in the previous period and talking about four values, namely, harmony with nature, simplicity in consumption, interpersonal relationships, and social justice. In these were seen active as well as cognitive and affective components. All three dimensions were met by those terms and those four values were before us, and someone rather quickly in the discussion said 'I would zero in on the interpersonal relationship or translate that to support community', which is where we just left off.

That group seemed to be saying at that point that we must be charged ourselves and we must exemplify in our own life styles that which we want to engender in others...both in our knowing, because we were beginning to talk about the educational task, and in the way we are trying to influence mind sets and as we're trying to change policies. But we sometimes have to be that ourselves and the community is the place where we act out the knowing and the doing of style, and are that.

The whole value scheme was challenged in several ways. Just how do you adjudicate, since we all seem to affirm all four values? Does anyone disagree? Some of you seemed as if you were encountering a command of "Thou shalt be good", and it felt very abstract, moralistic and it doesn't really get you very far. We were trying to say how we could avoid dangers of vagueness or unfruitful abstractions. Some saw value in the use of the case studies à la Dr. Morgan as kind of symbolic windows from which you could look at it in terms of policy implications in a historical perspective and then test that over against some conceptual framework. In another means we drew a "nonelitist" approach -- and that's the word that's been going through a lot of these discussions -- without denying the value of a kind of systems analysis and that kind of perspective in planning. How do we avoid that kind of dilemma? It was suggested that there were various ways that had developed throughout the conference. Another theme that I heard is the resolution of conflicts: the harmonizing issue of yesterday was with us. If I think correctly, there is a common affirmation of a trade-off approach in terms of life style. Some people in their life styles are going to come down very strongly on harmony with nature and simplicity in consumption, while others are going to stress the social justice pole, or probably in various places representing a bit of both. Altogether, it will be an evolving kind of thing, not perfect order. There'll be diversity in that, but there'll be some new kinds of trade-off if we have an adequate kind of support community and a process by which the exchange, the wrestling with the concrete issues of education and policy making, are to take place. Underneath it all, I suppose, is the educational process and closer than that is a kind of participatory involvement, involving the actional, the cognitive, and the affective.

Ferré - Would you explain a little more for us, because you did mention quite truthfully that the word "elitist" came up a number of times in various groups: what is meant by elitist?

Reply - I think that we almost ended with that as a question under discussion.

Ferré - Let me give a counter argument just for a moment. If you really want to be ecological and take organic models, we have to recognize that organisms, complex organisms, have differentiation of function, that the eye does things that the tongue doesn't do, for example. So one could almost say that the function of the eye, of vision, is to permit us to anticipate touch in advance while there's still time or to help the tongue know what it's going to be experiencing after awhile, and I wonder to what extent there may not be a point to an organic conception in which some members of society are specialized in the direction of looking ahead and specialized in the direction of the cerebration functions: Is this elitist in some objectionable sense?

Comment - Not only that, you may actually mistake the "elite". For instance in New York City, garbage collectors make more than school teachers, and we could do without school teachers for a considerable length of time, but we couldn't do without garbage collection. We're likely to think of school teachers as the elite, but the facts of society are that the garbage collectors are the elite at least relative to school teachers.

Ferré - Yes, you can go with your eyes in bandages for quite a few days, but if you are constipated for a number of times, you're in trouble. I think there is a direct analogy here.

Comment - No, I don't think it's direct. The analogy doesn't hold because the tongue really doesn't care what the eye is doing.

Ferré - Talking about bowels, about garbage collectors, it's painful when the bowels aren't working immediately!

Comment - I think there is also a mood of wanting freedom and self determination which labels anybody that wants to tell me what to do as being elitist. Isn't this word being used too widely? Doesn't it usually mean a very, very narrow class of people who had aristocratic background or inherited wealth? But now all of a sudden, it's applied to doctors and lawyers and everybody else. It seems to me that just because somebody is a specialist he's designated as elitist. The word is being changed in its meaning.

Comment - The issue may be more nearly accountability than elitism.

Comment - Isn't it rather the way in which information functions from an elite to the body politic? It isn't elitism at all, it's that elite may function by imposing, or by informing and persuading. Either is behavior control. I'd call them specialists.

Ferré - One of the functions as I understand it that Phil hoped for in this group and in other meetings like it would be that we would try to look ahead, to try to think ahead and to try to come up with some persuasive guidance that would assist society to organize itself in a different way, and I gather that this function would not be elitist. I think it's more important to get people to make better decisions than to maximize the alternatives.

Comment - Maximizing the alternatives may help.

Ferré - I'm not a Hegelian, but an analytical philosopher and not given to great syntheses, but it does seem to me, interestingly enough, and I think without forcing that this last report, having to do with education utterly requires both the cognitive reconstruction and the affective community support systems that the other two groups were talking about, that this is essential if we're going to have education that will influence mind sets, and will transform society in needed directions. Somehow into education there's going to have to be both this cognitive restructuring in terms of what can be taken to be warranted fact, what we can reliably be skeptical about, and what we can reliably be hopeful about in terms of possible truth values and in terms of the kind of support for humanness that is ideally present in the church.

Comment - If we have to wait for the restructuring of society to deal with the environment, well bye-bye environment. It seems to me the conclusion we want to get out of this is much more appropriate in terms of finding things in the theological traditions which will justify adequate environmental ethics for the present. If we have to deal with all the problems that sociologists have found in our society, my goodness, we'll never get to the environment.

Michael Moore - I'd like to make a kind of personal religious statement, which reflects my own bias and what I take to be my ministry on what I take to be the implications of the Whiteheadian system as Professor Riggan outlined it, and for that matter on the entire conference, which I think has been going under the assumption that 'bye-bye environment' only means 'bye-bye environment-suitable-for-human-existence'. As I see it, the religious reconstruction we're considering is aimed at safeguarding the environment such that it is suitable for human existence, just as I take the Whiteheadian view, at least Professor Riggan's view; as being whatever is required to sustain a consciousness state, that is to say human beings or something very like them, on earth. I take it as my interpretation that the responsibility of human beings, of Christians in particular to safeguard, as we've implied in other connections, the environment for its own sake as it includes man, but also, if necessary in complete contradistinction from it. Therefore, I would say that religious reconstruction involves giving expression to strengths of the faith - those which I find chiefly in the Scripture and to some extent in the tradition and in modern philosophical and theological systems. Those strengths lay on us the responsibility of caring as stewards for all existence. That is to say, existence in the sense that includes non-living things as well as living things and particularly non-human things as well as human things. I'm not sure that it's germane to the conference at this late stage to enter that, but what I consider to be the weakness of the Whiteheadian system at this point is for me a crucial weakness, and I consider my responsibility as a Christian to be to care for the whole earth in the broadest possible sense of "whole". We've bandied about the term of holistic approach and each time

I think we secretly compartmentalize that to mean the whole of human existence or the whole of living things, certainly never the whole of all things created, which is to say all things that exist insofar as they exist.

Comment - Tragedies are going to occur and are going to cause frustration, anger and hostilities and disease among ethnic groups and among nations. We should be there to interpret it in an ecological and ultimately a theological contrast because that would be part of the education.

Philip Joranson - There have been some clear examples of this kind of concern on a global basis. One of these was the notion of discussing the agenda for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in advance in regional meetings so that there would be some opportunity for nations of all kinds, of whichever "world" - first, second, third (!) - to say something before the final UN conference got under way, and this procedure turned out to be very fruitful. There are other efforts like this under way. The UN conference on Population comes up pretty soon and already meetings are being held to try to come at some of the issues and to begin the work of understanding the different peoples and states. If I may add here, very quickly, something I mentioned in an earlier session, I think the most helpful kind of thing that could happen now is that we stress any kind of mechanism or basic positioning or relationships which would help us as individuals to stand forth and confront the new world. Who am I; what am I really like: What does the very language I use betray about whether or not I am ready for the demands of interaction on a global basis - with all of the world's peoples - with all the environment? Am I really ready as a person, for these newly perceived demands of life? Am I fundamentally ready, but just a little off the track because my traditions aren't quite the best here and there? Or do I need a whole new positioning, or need to look at the possibility of a whole new positioning in the total structures? I think this is as necessary a question for individuals as it is for groups and nations, and particularly in the global framework.